

Quantum field theory and its symmetry reduction

Jonathan Engle*

*Institute for Gravitational Physics and Geometry,
Physics Department, Penn State, University Park, PA 16802, USA*

Abstract

The relation between symmetry reduction before and after quantization of a field theory is discussed using a toy model: the axisymmetric Klein-Gordon field. We consider three possible notions of symmetry at the quantum level: invariance under the group action, and two notions derived from imposing symmetry as a system of constraints a la Dirac, reformulated as a first class system. One of the latter two turns out to be the most appropriate notion of symmetry in the sense that it satisfies a number of physical criteria, including the commutativity of quantization and symmetry reduction. Somewhat surprisingly, the requirement of invariance under the symmetry group action is *not* appropriate for this purpose. A generalization of the physically selected notion of symmetry to loop quantum gravity is presented and briefly discussed.

PACS numbers: 03.70.+k, 04.60.Ds, 04.60.Pp

arXiv:gr-qc/0511107v3 1 Apr 2006

*Electronic address: engle@gravity.psu.edu

1. INTRODUCTION

In loop quantum cosmology (LQC), an issue of primary importance is the relation to the full theory, loop quantum gravity (LQG). For introductions to loop quantum gravity, see [1], and for loop quantum cosmology, see [2]. The issue of the relation to the full theory is particularly important as possible predictions testable by cosmological observations are starting to be made based on LQC [3]. It is important to know to what extent tests of such possible predictions will in fact be tests of full loop quantum gravity.

Other symmetry reduced models in loop quantum gravity have also been constructed, for example, for the purpose of better understanding quantum black holes [4].

In dealing with either of these reduced models, the underlying hope is that quantization and symmetry reduction commute in the case of loop quantum gravity, in some sense. The question of commutation of symmetry reduction and quantization is an old one. However, it is sometimes not appreciated that the question of whether commutation is achieved depends in a critical way on what one means by the “symmetric sector” of the full quantum theory. One would like the “symmetric sector” of the full quantum theory (defined in some physically well-motivated way) to be isomorphic to the reduced-then-quantized theory.¹ If one can achieve such an isomorphism, not only at the level of Hilbert space structure, but also at the level of dynamics, one will have achieved full commutation of symmetry reduction and quantization. One may also have partial commutation: it may be that it is only the Hilbert space structure of the reduced theory that is isomorphic to the “symmetric sector” of the full theory. Nevertheless, even in such a situation one can ask if there is some choice of Hamiltonian operator in the reduced theory that “best” represents the information contained in the Hamiltonian of the full theory.

We will address all of these issues, but in the simple context where the full theory is well understood: the axisymmetric, free Klein-Gordon field in Minkowski space. However, this analysis will suggest a generalization to more interesting contexts. In particular, in the conclusions, a programme of application to loop quantum gravity will be sketched.

At first the fact that there is an “ambiguity” in the notion of symmetry seems surprising. However, there are at least two possible approaches to defining a notion of symmetry at the quantum level:

1. Demanding invariance under the action of the symmetry group
2. Taking a system of constraints that classically isolates the symmetric sector, and then imposing these constraints as one would in constrained quantization.

In the case of the axisymmetric Klein-Gordon theory, the notion of symmetry in sense 1 above is straightforward: a state is axisymmetric if it is annihilated by $\hat{L}_z$, the operator corresponding to the total angular momentum in the z direction, since this is the generator of the action of rotations about the z axis.

However, we will also find two distinct, but natural ways of implementing notion 2, corresponding to two different ways of reformulating the symmetry constraints as a first

¹ The phrase “reduced-then-quantized theory” is of course just as ambiguous as the phrase “quantize.” What is meant here, roughly, is the reduced theory quantized as a theory on the reduced spatial manifold (pp.12,29), using the same quantization methods as in the full theory.

class system — to be referred to as reformulations A and B, as defined below. Thus in this paper we actually consider three distinct notions of symmetry:

1. Requiring invariance under the action of the symmetry group ($\hat{\mathbb{L}}_z \Psi = 0$).
2. Imposition of $\mathcal{L}_\phi \hat{\varphi}(x) \Psi = 0$. (Constraint reformulation A.)
3. Imposition of $a([\mathcal{L}_\phi f, \mathcal{L}_\phi g]) \Psi = 0$. (Constraint reformulation B.)

where ϕ^a is the axial Killing field on Minkowski space generating rotation about the z axis. In 3, $[f, g]$ denotes the phase space point determined by the initial data $\varphi = f$, $\pi = g$, with $a([f, g])$ denoting the associated annihilation operator (see next section). We shall refer to these notions of symmetry as “invariance symmetry”, “A-symmetry”, and “B-symmetry”, respectively. A state satisfying one of these conditions of symmetry will likewise be referred to as “invariant”, “A-symmetric”, or “B-symmetric”.

In the rest of this paper, these three notions of symmetry will be explained, justified, characterized and compared in detail. Simpler, less central results will be stated without proof. The A-symmetric sector (with appropriate choice of inner product) and B-symmetric sector of the quantum theory will turn out to be naturally isomorphic to the reduced-then-quantized Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_{red}$. Thus A-symmetry and B-symmetry as notions of symmetry achieve commutation of quantization and reduction. Furthermore

- A-symmetry and B-symmetry are strictly stronger than invariance symmetry. That is, if a state is A-symmetric or B-symmetric, it is also invariant.
- The space of A-symmetric states is the space of wavefunctions with support only on symmetric configurations.² It is thus the analogue of the notion of symmetry used by Bojowald in quantum cosmology.
- The space of B-symmetric states is equal to the span of the set of coherent states associated with the symmetric sector of the classical theory.
- In a precise sense, B-symmetric states are those in which all non-symmetric modes are unexcited.
- For B-symmetric states, fluctuations away from axisymmetry are minimized in a precise sense.
- The quantum Hamiltonian preserves the space of invariant states and the space of B-symmetric states, but not the space of A-symmetric states.³

Because of the last four items on this list, we argue that B-symmetry should be preferred over A-symmetry as an embedding of the reduced theory.

We then motivate and discuss a prescription for carrying arbitrary operators in the full theory over to the reduced theory. Finally, in the conclusions, we summarize what has been

² Although this seems obvious at first, the rigorous formulation of this statement is more non-trivial to prove.

³ Therefore B-symmetry achieves full commutation of reduction and quantization, whereas A-symmetry achieves commutation only at the level of Hilbert space structure.

learned and discuss application to loop quantum gravity. For convenience of the reader we have collected definitions of mathematical symbols in appendix B.

We conclude with a conceptually important point. One may object that commutation of reduction and quantization is achieved only because we have chosen to use “indirect” notions of symmetry, rather than the obvious notion of invariance under the symmetry group. But, in fact, in quantum gravity, if the question of commutation is even to be *posed* (in a non-trivial way), one *must* use a notion of symmetry other than invariance symmetry. For, in quantum gravity, after the diffeomorphism constraint has been solved, the action of the symmetry group (if it is a spatial symmetry) is trivial, and so invariance symmetry becomes a vacuous notion. The reason for this is that the symmetry group becomes a subgroup of the gauge group of the canonical theory.⁴ But if this is the case in quantum gravity, perhaps, then, one should not be surprised if also in other theories invariance symmetry is inappropriate for commutation questions. Indeed, in the Klein-Gordon case at hand, not only is invariance symmetry less desirable in that it does not achieve commutation, but B-symmetry satisfies many physical criteria which invariance symmetry does not (see list of results above).

2. PRELIMINARIES: REVIEW OF QUANTIZATION OF THE KLEIN-GORDON FIELD

First, let us review those aspects of the treatment [5] of the quantization of the free Klein-Gordon theory that will be used in the rest of this paper. This section will also serve to fix notation.

A. Classical theory

Let Σ denote a fixed Cauchy surface: a spatial hyperplane in Minkowski space. Let q_{ab} denote the induced Euclidean metric on Σ . The phase space Γ is a vector space parametrized by two smooth real scalar fields $\varphi(x)$ and $\pi(x)$ on Σ with an appropriate fall-off at infinity. (The precise fall-off condition is unimportant for our purposes.) The symplectic structure is simply

$$\Omega([\varphi, \pi], [\varphi', \pi']) = \int_{\Sigma} (\pi\varphi' - \varphi\pi') d^3x \quad (2.1)$$

so that the Poisson brackets between the basic variables are

$$\{\varphi(x), \pi(y)\} = \delta^3(x, y) \quad (2.2)$$

and $\{\varphi(x), \varphi(y)\} = \{\pi(x), \pi(y)\} = 0$. In a word, Γ is the cotangent bundle over the space of all smooth fields φ on Σ (with appropriate fall-off imposed).

The Hamiltonian of the scalar field with mass m is

$$\mathbb{H} = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Sigma} \{\pi^2 + (\vec{\nabla}\varphi) \cdot (\vec{\nabla}\varphi) + m^2\varphi^2\} d^3x \quad (2.3)$$

⁴ As discussed in the conclusions, this situation can be exactly mimicked in the axisymmetric Klein-Gordon case by simply declaring the three components of the total angular momentum to be constraints, so that the canonical gauge group is just the group of $SO(3)$ rotations about the origin.

From this Hamiltonian, one derives the equations of motion to be

$$\dot{\varphi} = \pi \quad (2.4)$$

$$\dot{\pi} = \Delta\varphi - m^2\varphi \quad (2.5)$$

where Δ is the Laplacian on Σ . Let $\Theta := -\Delta + m^2$. Choosing the complex structure

$$J[\varphi, \pi] = [-\Theta^{-\frac{1}{2}}\pi, \Theta^{\frac{1}{2}}\varphi] \quad (2.6)$$

we turn Γ into a complex vector space. The Hermitian inner product thereby determined on Γ is then

$$\begin{aligned} \langle [\varphi, \pi], [\varphi', \pi'] \rangle &:= \frac{1}{2}\Omega(J[\varphi, \pi], [\varphi', \pi']) - \frac{i}{2}\Omega([\varphi, \pi], [\varphi', \pi']) \\ &= \frac{1}{2}(\Theta^{\frac{1}{2}}\varphi, \varphi') + \frac{1}{2}(\Theta^{-\frac{1}{2}}\pi, \pi') - \frac{i}{2}(\pi, \varphi') + \frac{i}{2}(\varphi, \pi') \end{aligned} \quad (2.7)$$

where for f, g functions on Σ , we define $(f, g) := \int_{\Sigma} fg d^3x$. Completing Γ with respect to this Hermitian inner product gives the single particle Hilbert space h .

In constructing the Hilbert space for the field theory, one then has two possible approaches: the Fock and Schrödinger approaches.

B. Fock quantization

In the Fock approach, the full Hilbert space is constructed as

$$\mathcal{H} := \mathcal{F}_s(h) := \bigoplus_{n=0}^{\infty} \bigotimes_s^n h \quad (2.8)$$

where $\bigotimes_s^n h$ denotes the symmetrized tensor product of n copies of h .⁵

For each n , the inner product on h induces a unique inner product on $\bigotimes_s^n h$ via the condition

$$\langle \psi_1 \otimes \psi_2 \otimes \cdots \otimes \psi_n, \phi_1 \otimes \phi_2 \otimes \cdots \otimes \phi_n \rangle_{\bigotimes_s^n h} = \langle \psi_1, \phi_1 \rangle \langle \psi_2, \phi_2 \rangle \cdots \langle \psi_n, \phi_n \rangle \quad (2.9)$$

for all $\{\psi_i\}, \{\phi_i\} \in h$. This in turn induces an inner product on $\bigotimes_s^n h$.

Let $A, B, C \dots$ denote abstract indices associated with the single particle Hilbert space h . Let prime denote topological dual. Then, for each n , define the complex conjugation map $\bigotimes_s^n h \mapsto (\bigotimes_s^n h)'$, $\psi^{A_1 \dots A_n} \mapsto \bar{\psi}_{A_1 \dots A_n}$ by

$$\bar{\psi}_{A_1 \dots A_n} \phi^{A_1 \dots A_n} := \langle \psi, \phi \rangle_{\bigotimes_s^n h}. \quad (2.10)$$

A given member $\Psi \in \mathcal{H} = \mathcal{F}_s(h)$ takes the form

$$\Psi = (\psi, \psi^{A_1}, \psi^{A_1 A_2}, \psi^{A_1 A_2 A_3}, \dots) \quad (2.11)$$

⁵ That is, $\bigotimes_s^n h$ is the space of all continuous multilinear maps $\bigotimes^n h' \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$; $\bigotimes_s^n h$ is then the space of all members of $\bigotimes^n h$ invariant under arbitrary permutations of arguments.

with each component $\psi^{A_1 \dots A_n}$ satisfying $\psi^{A_1 \dots A_n} = \psi^{(A_1 \dots A_n)}$. The inner product on $\mathcal{H}$ is then defined by

$$\langle \Psi, \Phi \rangle = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \bar{\psi}_{A_1 \dots A_n} \phi^{A_1 \dots A_n}. \quad (2.12)$$

Given an element $\xi^A = [\varphi, \pi]^A \in h$, one has associated creation and annihilation operators which act on $\mathcal{H}$ by

$$a^\dagger(\xi)\Psi := (0, \psi\xi^{A_1}, \sqrt{2}\xi^{(A_1}\psi^{A_2)}, \sqrt{3}\xi^{(A_1}\psi^{A_2A_3)}, \dots) \quad (2.13)$$

$$a(\xi)\Psi := (\bar{\xi}_A\psi^A, \sqrt{2}\bar{\xi}_A\psi^{AA_1}, \sqrt{3}\bar{\xi}_A\psi^{AA_1A_2}, \dots) \quad (2.14)$$

One can check

$$[a(\xi), a^\dagger(\eta)] = \langle \xi, \eta \rangle \mathbb{1} \quad (2.15)$$

The unique normalized state annihilated by all the annihilation operators is the vacuum; it is given by

$$\Psi_0 := (1, 0, 0, 0, \dots) \quad (2.16)$$

In terms of the creation and annihilation operators, the representation of the smeared field operators is given by

$$\hat{\varphi}[f] := i\{a([0, f]) - a^\dagger([0, f])\} \quad (2.17)$$

$$\hat{\pi}[g] := -i\{a([g, 0]) - a^\dagger([g, 0])\} \quad (2.18)$$

With these definitions, one can check

$$[\hat{\varphi}[f], \hat{\pi}[g]] = i \int_{\Sigma} d^3x f g \equiv i(f, g) \quad (2.19)$$

with all other commutators zero, so that (2.17) indeed gives a representation of the Poisson algebra of smeared field variables (2.2).

It is useful to note that, by using the fact that $a^\dagger(\xi)$ is linear and $a(\xi)$ is anti-linear in ξ , one can invert (2.17) to obtain an expression for the creation and annihilation operators in terms of the field operators:

$$a([f, g]) = \frac{1}{2}\hat{\varphi}[\Theta^{\frac{1}{2}}f - ig] + \frac{1}{2}\hat{\pi}[\Theta^{-\frac{1}{2}}g + if] \quad (2.20)$$

$$a^\dagger([f, g]) = \frac{1}{2}\hat{\varphi}[\Theta^{\frac{1}{2}}f + ig] + \frac{1}{2}\hat{\pi}[\Theta^{-\frac{1}{2}}g - if]$$

These expressions can then be carried over to the classical theory to obtain functions on Γ which are classical analogues of the creation and annihilation operators. Upon simplifying the expressions for these classical analogues, one obtains the remarkably simple result

$$a([f, g]) = \langle [f, g], [\varphi, \pi] \rangle \quad (2.21)$$

$$a^\dagger([f, g]) = \langle [\varphi, \pi], [f, g] \rangle \quad (2.22)$$

The Poisson brackets among these classical analogues exactly mimic the commutators of the quantum counterparts.

Next, we quantize the Hamiltonian. Rewriting the classical Hamiltonian (2.3),

$$\mathbb{H} = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Sigma} (\pi^2 - \varphi \Delta \varphi + m^2 \varphi^2) d^3x \quad (2.23)$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Sigma} (\pi^2 + \varphi \Theta \varphi) d^3x \quad (2.24)$$

From (2.4) and (2.6), we obtain the single particle Hamiltonian operator on h ,

$$\hat{H}[\varphi, \pi] := J \frac{d}{dt} [\varphi, \pi] \quad (2.25)$$

$$= [\Theta^{\frac{1}{2}} \varphi, \Theta^{\frac{1}{2}} \pi] \quad (2.26)$$

In terms of this, the classical Hamiltonian can be expressed as

$$\mathbb{H} = \langle [\varphi, \pi], \hat{H}[\varphi, \pi] \rangle \quad (2.27)$$

Let $\{\xi_i = [f_i, g_i]\}$ denote an arbitrary orthonormal basis of h . Then

$$\mathbb{H} = \sum_{i,j} \langle [\varphi, \pi], \xi_i \rangle \langle \xi_i, \hat{H} \xi_j \rangle \langle \xi_j, [\varphi, \pi] \rangle \quad (2.28)$$

$$= \sum_{i,j} \langle \xi_i, \hat{H} \xi_j \rangle a^\dagger(\xi_i) a(\xi_j) \quad (2.29)$$

Which is an expression that can be taken directly over to the quantum theory, using normal ordering:

$$\hat{\mathbb{H}} = \sum_{i,j} \langle \xi_i, \hat{H} \xi_j \rangle a^\dagger(\xi_i) a(\xi_j) \quad (2.30)$$

C. Schrödinger quantization

As mentioned, the classical phase space Γ has a cotangent bundle structure $T^*\mathcal{C}$ over some appropriately defined configuration space $\mathcal{C}$.

In the case of a finite number of degrees of freedom, the standard way to quantize a cotangent bundle $T^*\mathcal{C}$ is via a Schrödinger representation – that is, a representation of the field operators on an $L^2(\mathcal{C}, d\mu)$ for some appropriately chosen measure μ .

In the field theory case, however, the measures one is interested in using are usually not supported on the classical configuration space $\mathcal{C}$, but rather on some appropriate distributional-like extension $\overline{\mathcal{C}}$. This extension is referred to as the *quantum configuration space*.

In the case of the free Klein-Gordon field in Minkowski space, the appropriate quantum configuration space can be taken to be the space of tempered distributions $\mathcal{S}'(\Sigma)$ on Σ [6]. $\mathcal{S}(\Sigma)$ denotes the space of Schwarz functions equipped with the appropriate topology [7], and the prime indicates the topological dual. From here on φ will denote an element of $\mathcal{S}'(\Sigma)$.

The appropriate measure is the Gaussian measure heuristically given by the expression

$$“d\mu = \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} (\varphi, \Theta^{\frac{1}{2}} \varphi) \right\} \mathcal{D}\varphi” \quad (2.31)$$

where $\mathcal{D}\varphi$ is the fictitious translation-invariant “Lesbesgue” measure on $\mathcal{S}'(\Sigma)$. To more rigorously define the measure, one can specify its *Fourier transform*. The Fourier transform of a measure μ is defined by

$$\chi_\mu(f) := \int_{\varphi \in \mathcal{S}'(\Sigma)} e^{i\varphi(f)} d\mu \quad (2.32)$$

for $f \in \mathcal{S}(\Sigma)$. The Fourier transform giving rise to (the rigorous version of) the measure in (2.31) is

$$\chi_\mu(f) = \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2}(f, \Theta^{-\frac{1}{2}}f) \right\} \quad (2.33)$$

For further details, see [6].

$\mathcal{H} = L^2(\mathcal{S}'(\Sigma), d\mu)$ is then the Hilbert space of states in the quantum field theory. For this paper it will also be necessary to introduce a certain dense subset of $\mathcal{H}$ — the space of *cylindrical functions*. A function $\Psi : \mathcal{S}'(\Sigma) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is called *cylindrical* if $\Psi[\varphi] = F(\varphi(e_1), \dots, \varphi(e_n))$ for some $\{e_1, \dots, e_n\} \subseteq \mathcal{S}(\Sigma)$ (referred to as “probes”) and some smooth function $F : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ (with growth less than exponential). More specifically, such a Ψ is said to be *cylindrical with respect to* the “probes” $e_1, \dots, e_n$. Let the space of cylindrical functions be denoted Cyl .

Next, the representation of the field observables on $\mathcal{H}$ is

$$(\hat{\varphi}[f]\Psi)[\varphi] := \varphi[f]\Psi[\varphi] \quad (2.34)$$

$$\begin{aligned} (\hat{\pi}[g]\Psi)[\varphi] &:= \left[\text{Self-adjoint part of } -i \int_{\Sigma} d^3x g \frac{\delta}{\delta\varphi} \right] \Psi[\varphi] \\ &= -i \int_{\Sigma} d^3x \left(g \frac{\delta}{\delta\varphi} - \varphi \Theta^{\frac{1}{2}} g \right) \Psi[\varphi] \end{aligned} \quad (2.35)$$

We then use equations (2.20) to define creation and annihilation operators in the Schrödinger picture. Substituting (2.34) and (2.35) into these expressions and simplifying, we obtain

$$a([f, g]) = \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Sigma} d^3x \left(f - i\Theta^{-\frac{1}{2}}g \right) \frac{\delta}{\delta\varphi} \quad (2.36)$$

$$a^\dagger([f, g]) = \hat{\varphi}[\Theta^{\frac{1}{2}}f + ig] - \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Sigma} d^3x \left(f + i\Theta^{-\frac{1}{2}}g \right) \frac{\delta}{\delta\varphi} \quad (2.37)$$

(In (2.36), the $\hat{\varphi}$ terms exactly cancel, leaving only a $\delta/\delta\varphi$ term.) The unique normalized state in the kernel of all of the annihilation operators is

$$\Psi_0[\varphi] \equiv 1 \quad (2.38)$$

The availability of a vacuum state and creation and annihilation operators in the Schrödinger picture allows one to construct a mapping from the Fock Hilbert space into the Schrödinger Hilbert space. One finds that the mapping is unitary, so that the Fock and Schrödinger descriptions of the theory are equivalent.

Substituting (2.36), (2.37) into (2.30) and simplifying,

$$\hat{\mathbb{H}} = \int_{\Sigma^2} d^3x d^3y A(x, y) \varphi(y) \frac{\delta}{\delta\varphi(x)} - \int_{\Sigma^2} d^3x d^3y B(x, y) \frac{\delta^2}{\delta\varphi(x) \delta\varphi(y)} \quad (2.39)$$

where

$$A(x, y) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j} \langle \xi_i, \hat{H} \xi_j \rangle (f_j - i\Theta^{-\frac{1}{2}} g_j)(x) (\Theta^{\frac{1}{2}} f_i + i g_i)(y) \quad (2.40)$$

$$B(x, y) = \frac{1}{4} \sum_{i,j} \langle \xi_i, \hat{H} \xi_j \rangle (f_i + i\Theta^{-\frac{1}{2}} g_i)(x) (f_j - i\Theta^{-\frac{1}{2}} g_j)(y) \quad (2.41)$$

where, as before, $\{\xi_i \equiv [f_i, g_i]\}$ is an orthonormal basis of the single particle Hilbert space. By integrating $A(x, y)$ and $B(x, y)$ against test functions, one can show that $A(x, y)$ is the integral kernel of $\Theta^{\frac{1}{2}}$ and $B(x, y) = \frac{1}{2} \delta^3(x, y)$. Thus, ⁶

$$\hat{\mathbb{H}} = \int_{\Sigma} d^3x \left\{ (\Theta^{\frac{1}{2}} \varphi)(x) \frac{\delta}{\delta \varphi(x)} - \frac{1}{2} \frac{\delta^2}{\delta \varphi(x) \delta \varphi(x)} \right\} \quad (2.42)$$

At first the rigorous meaning of this expression may not be obvious. However, note that for any cylindrical function $\Psi[\varphi] = F(\varphi(e_1), \dots, \varphi(e_n))$,

$$\frac{\delta}{\delta \varphi(x)} \Psi[\varphi] = \sum_{i=1}^n e_i(x) (\partial_i F)(\varphi(e_1), \dots, \varphi(e_n)). \quad (2.43)$$

Therefore, the action of $\hat{\mathbb{H}}$ (2.42) on the space of cylindrical functions, Cyl , is well defined. Furthermore one can check that $\hat{\mathbb{H}}$ preserves Cyl . In proving this, the fact that there is no term quadratic in φ in (2.42) is important.⁷ Since Cyl is dense in $\mathcal{H}$, we may take Cyl to be the domain of $\hat{\mathbb{H}}$; with this domain choice, one can show that $\hat{\mathbb{H}}$ is essentially self-adjoint. Thus, $\hat{\mathbb{H}}$ with domain Cyl has a unique self-adjoint extension, and it is this self-adjoint extension that we henceforth take to be the meaning of $\hat{\mathbb{H}}$.

3. SOME DIFFERENT METHODS OF IMPOSING SYMMETRY

A. Classical analysis

As mentioned in the introduction, incorporation of symmetry by requiring invariance under the action of the symmetry group is straightforward in the present context: it corresponds to requiring a state to be annihilated by the operator $\hat{\mathbb{L}}_z$ corresponding to the z component of the total angular momentum. However, selection of the symmetric sector via imposition of a system of constraints deserves further explanation.

Classically the condition for symmetry takes the form of the constraints

$$\mathcal{L}_\phi \varphi = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{L}_\phi \pi = 0 \quad (3.1)$$

⁶ To our knowledge, expression (2.42) has not appeared in the literature.

⁷ The reason the φ^2 term is absent is that our quantum measure is Gaussian. Thus there is a tight relation between kinematics (the choice of measure, and hence the representation of the quantum algebra) and dynamics (the Hamiltonian operator). This relates to the usual statement that in quantum field theory “dynamics dictates the choice of kinematics”!

If we smear the constraints, they take the form

$$\varphi[\mathcal{L}_\phi f] = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \pi[\mathcal{L}_\phi f] = 0 \quad (3.2)$$

for all test functions f in $\mathcal{S}(\Sigma)$, the space of Schwarz functions. The form of the smearings $\mathcal{L}_\phi f$ and $\mathcal{L}_\phi g$ comes from an integration by parts. More generally, the significance of the form $\mathcal{L}_\phi f$ for test functions is the following. Let $\mathcal{S}(\Sigma)_{inv}$ denote the space of elements of $\mathcal{S}(\Sigma)$ Lie dragged by ϕ^a . One can show that the space all test functions of the form $\mathcal{L}_\phi f$ is precisely the orthogonal complement of $\mathcal{S}(\Sigma)_{inv}$ in $\mathcal{S}(\Sigma)$ (with respect to the usual inner product). Thus, another way to view the above set of smeared constraints is that they are the non-symmetric components of the fields; by requiring these to vanish, we impose symmetry.

Therefore, what we would ideally like to do in the quantum theory is impose

$$\hat{\varphi}[\mathcal{L}_\phi f]\Psi = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{\pi}[\mathcal{L}_\phi f]\Psi = 0 \quad (3.3)$$

for all $f \in \mathcal{S}(\Sigma)$. However, the proposed system of constraints is second class, and, as Dirac taught us, such systems of constraints cannot be consistently imposed in quantum theory in this fashion. One will find that the unique solution to these constraints is the zero vector.

To get around this difficulty, the strategy is to reformulate the constraints (3.2) as an equivalent first class system. We consider two such reformulations:

- (A) the set of constraints $\{\varphi[\mathcal{L}_\phi f]\}_{f \in \mathcal{S}(\Sigma)}$
- (B) the set of constraints $\{a([\mathcal{L}_\phi f, \mathcal{L}_\phi g])\}_{f, g \in \mathcal{S}(\Sigma)}$

We will refer to these as constraint set (A) and constraint set (B). Note that $a([f, g])$ here is the classical analogue of the annihilation operator as given in (2.21). Thus, constraint set (B) consists in complex linear combinations of the constraints in (3.2). Each of the constraint sets (A) and (B) forms a first class system. Although the constraint set (A) is obtained by simply dropping all the constraints on momenta, nevertheless as explained below (A) is in a certain sense (relevant for quantum theory) equivalent to the full set of constraints.

We should also mention that other proposals for imposing second class constraints have been made in the past, such as that proposed in Klauder's 'universal procedure' for imposing constraints [8]. There is in fact a relation between approach (B) here and Klauder's approach: The former is a case of the latter with some natural choices made. This is discussed later on in section 6B of this paper. In addition approach (B) has similarities to the method of imposing second class constraints discussed in [10], as was noticed after this work was completed.

Let us introduce some notation. Let $\Gamma = \{[\varphi, \pi]\}$ be the full classical phase space. Let

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_{inv} &:= \{[\varphi, \pi] \in \Gamma \mid \mathcal{L}_\phi \varphi = 0 \text{ and } \mathcal{L}_\phi \pi = 0\} \\ \Gamma_A &:= \{[\varphi, \pi] \in \Gamma \mid \mathcal{L}_\phi \varphi = 0\} \\ \Gamma_B &:= \{[\varphi, \pi] \in \Gamma \mid a([\mathcal{L}_\phi f, \mathcal{L}_\phi g])|_{[\varphi, \pi]} = 0 \quad \forall f, g \in \mathcal{S}(\Sigma)\} \end{aligned}$$

So that Γ_A is the constraint surface associated with constraint set (A), and Γ_B is the constraint surface associated with constraint set (B).

Analysis of constraint set A

Since constraint set (A) is obtained by dropping constraints from the full set (3.2), it is not surprising that Γ_A is larger than Γ_{inv} . However, the symplectic structure induced on Γ_A via pull-back, $\Omega_A := i^*\Omega$, is degenerate – as we should expect since constraint set (A) is first class. The degenerate directions are just the “gauge” generated by the constraints $\varphi[\mathcal{L}_\phi f]$, namely $\pi(x) \mapsto \pi(x) + \mathcal{L}_\phi f$. If we divide out by this “gauge,” the resulting manifold, $\hat{\Gamma}_A$ is naturally isomorphic to Γ_{inv} .

One may object: this notion of “gauge” is not *physical* gauge; it is gauge generated by constraints that we have imposed completely by hand. This is true, but the point is that when a constraint is imposed at the quantum level, you automatically divide out by the corresponding “gauge” *whether or not the gauge is “physical”*.

At the quantum level, we will find that the solution to constraint set (A), when equipped with an appropriate inner product, is naturally isomorphic to the Hilbert space one obtains when first reducing and then quantizing. The fact that $\hat{\Gamma}_A$ is naturally isomorphic to Γ_{inv} is the imprint of this fact on the classical theory.

A final important note about constraint set (A) is that its elements *do not* weakly Poisson-commute with the total Hamiltonian for the free scalar field (2.3). This foreshadows the fact that in the quantum theory, the total Hamiltonian operator will not preserve the solution space to constraint set (A).

Analysis of constraint set B

First, it is important to note that the classical observable $a([f, g])$, when expanded out as $a([f, g]) = \langle [f, g], [\varphi, \pi] \rangle$, is a complex linear combination of the constraints (3.2). In fact, in rewriting the full constraint set (3.2) as constraint set (B), *no constraints have been dropped*. Rather, one has reduced the number of constraints by half by simply taking complex linear combinations of the original constraints.

It is easy to see how this works in a simpler example. Suppose we are working in a theory in which $\{x_1, x_2, x_3, p_1, p_2, p_3\}$ are the basic variables, and we want to impose the second class system of constraints $x_3 = 0, p_3 = 0$. The analogue of reformulation (A) in this context would be to just drop the $p_3 = 0$ constraint. The analogue of reformulation (B) would be to replace the two constraints with the single constraint $z_3 := x_3 + ip_3 = 0$. Obviously z_3 , being only a single constraint, makes up a first class system of constraints. Nevertheless, classically, $z_3 = 0$ is completely equivalent to $x_3 = 0$ and $p_3 = 0$. This is one of the strengths of reformulation strategy (B): the reformulation is classically completely equivalent to the original set of constraints, but is now a first class system so that it can be imposed consistently in quantum theory.

But one may object: how is this possible? You cannot change the fact that a certain constraint submanifold is first or second class merely by reformulating it in terms of different constraints because first-class and second-class character are *geometrical* properties of the constraint submanifold [9]. This is indeed true. Our underlying constraint submanifold is still *geometrically* a second-class constraint surface. We have merely allowed it to be *formally* expressed as a first class system by allowing our constraints to be complex. But fortunately, for a system of constraints to be consistently implementable in quantum theory, it is sufficient that they be only formally first class – i.e., that their Poisson brackets with each other vanish weakly.

So, $\Gamma_B = \Gamma_{inv}$.

Another fact that is important to note is that all the elements of constraint set (B) weakly Poisson-commute with the full Hamiltonian $\mathbb{H}$. This points to the fact that, in quantum theory, the full Hamiltonian operator $\hat{\mathbb{H}}$ *will* preserve the solution space to constraint set

(B).

B. Setting up the quantum analysis

Recall that Cyl denotes the space of cylindrical functions on $\mathcal{S}'(\Sigma)$. Let Cyl^* denote its algebraic dual.

Let

$$\mathcal{H}_{inv} := \{\Psi \in \mathcal{H} \mid \hat{\mathbb{L}}_z \Psi = 0\} \quad (3.4a)$$

$$\text{Cyl}_{inv}^* := \{\eta \in \text{Cyl}^* \mid \hat{\mathbb{L}}_z^* \eta = 0\} \quad (3.4b)$$

$$\text{Cyl}_A^* := \{\eta \in \text{Cyl}^* \mid \hat{\varphi}[\mathcal{L}_\phi f]^* \eta = 0 \quad \forall f \in \mathcal{S}(\Sigma)\} \quad (3.4c)$$

$$\mathcal{H}_B := \{\Psi \in \mathcal{H} \mid a([\mathcal{L}_\phi f, \mathcal{L}_\phi g])\Psi = 0 \quad \forall f, g \in \mathcal{S}(\Sigma)\} \quad (3.4d)$$

$\mathcal{H}_{inv}$ and Cyl_{inv}^* are the sets of elements in $\mathcal{H}$ and Cyl^* fixed by the natural action of rotations about the z-axis, whence they are implementations of “invariance symmetry,” the first notion of symmetry mentioned in the introduction. (Cyl_{inv}^* has been introduced simply for the purpose of comparison with Cyl_A^* .)

Cyl_A^* is the solution space for constraint set (A) at the quantum mechanical level. Constraint set (A) forces its solutions to have support only on symmetric configurations, as we shall see below. The space of symmetric configurations has measure zero with respect to the quantum measure μ on $\mathcal{S}'(\Sigma)$. Since μ characterizes the inner product in $\mathcal{H}$, all solutions to (A) in $\mathcal{H}$ thus have norm zero, whence one must go to Cyl^* to find non-trivial solutions. In other words, constraint set (A) admits only non-normalizable solutions.

In addition, one should note that the characterization of Cyl_A^* as the space of functions with support only on symmetric configurations makes Cyl_A^* the analogue of the notion of symmetry used by Bojowald to embed loop quantum cosmology and other symmetry reduced models into full loop quantum gravity [11].

$\mathcal{H}_B$ is the solution space for constraint set (B) at the quantum mechanical level.

4. THE STRUCTURE OF $\mathcal{H}$ AS $\mathcal{H}_{red} \otimes \mathcal{H}_\perp$

Before entering further into a quantum analysis of the different notions of symmetry, it will be convenient to develop apparatus for relating the Hilbert space in the full theory ($\mathcal{H}$) to the Hilbert space in the reduced theory ($\mathcal{H}_{red}$). The reduced theory is derived in appendix A.

We will denote the group of rotations about the z-axis by $\mathcal{T} \subset \text{Diff}(\Sigma)$. In the reduced theory, the spatial manifold is taken to be $B := \Sigma/\mathcal{T}$, and the quantum configuration space $\mathcal{S}'(B)$. Let $P : \Sigma \rightarrow B$ denote canonical projection. Let $\mathcal{S}'(\Sigma)_{inv}$ and $\mathcal{S}(\Sigma)_{inv}$ denote the $\mathcal{T}$ -invariant subspaces of $\mathcal{S}'(\Sigma)$ and $\mathcal{S}(\Sigma)$, respectively. $\mathcal{S}(\Sigma)_{inv}$ is then naturally identifiable with $\mathcal{S}(B)$; we make this identification. Define $I : \mathcal{S}'(\Sigma)_{inv} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}'(B)$ by $[I(\alpha)](f) := \alpha(P^* f)$. Let $\pi : \mathcal{S}(\Sigma) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}(B)$ denote group averaging with respect to the action of $\mathcal{T}$. We here use “group averaging” in a more general sense than usual in that we are not group averaging “states.” It will be convenient in this paper to let “group averaging” have this more general meaning of averaging elements of any vector space over the action of a group. One can show the pull-back $\pi^* : \mathcal{S}'(B) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}'(\Sigma)$ is the inverse of I , so that

Lemma 4.1. *I is an isomorphism.*

Thus $\mathcal{S}'(\Sigma)_{inv}$ and $\mathcal{S}'(B)$ are naturally isomorphic. Because of this, henceforth we will simply identify these two spaces. That is, the isomorphism I will sometimes not be explicitly written. In addition, we will sometimes implicitly use the fact that I is compatible with the structure of the cylindrical functions. Let Cyl_{red} denote the space of cylindrical functions in the reduced theory. We then have

Lemma 4.2. *If $\Phi \in \text{Cyl}$, then $\Phi \circ I^{-1} \in \text{Cyl}_{red} \subseteq \mathcal{H}_{red}$, and the map $\Phi \mapsto \Phi \circ I^{-1}$ is onto Cyl_{red} .*

Next, let $\Pi : \mathcal{S}'(\Sigma) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}'(\Sigma)_{inv}$ denote group averaging on $\mathcal{S}'(\Sigma)$ with respect to $\mathcal{T}$. Recall the quantum measure μ on $\mathcal{S}'(\Sigma)$ introduced in section 2 C. We then have the following result, which will be important in theorem 4.5:

Lemma 4.3. *$\Pi_*\mu = \mu_{red}$, where μ_{red} is the quantum measure in the reduced theory as constructed in appendix A.*

Let $\mathcal{S}'(\Sigma)_\perp := \text{Ker } \Pi$.

Lemma 4.4. $\mathcal{S}'(\Sigma) = \mathcal{S}'(\Sigma)_{inv} \oplus \mathcal{S}'(\Sigma)_\perp$.

Topologically, then, $\mathcal{S}'(\Sigma)$ has the structure $\mathcal{S}'(\Sigma) = \mathcal{S}'(\Sigma)_{inv} \times \mathcal{S}'(\Sigma)_\perp$. In terms of this structure, Π is canonical projection into the first factor. We will adopt the convention that if $\varphi \in \mathcal{S}'(\Sigma)$, then φ_s and $\varphi_\perp$ denote the components of φ with respect to the above decomposition.

Theorem 4.5. *μ is separable over $\mathcal{S}'(\Sigma) = \mathcal{S}'(\Sigma)_{inv} \times \mathcal{S}'(\Sigma)_\perp$. That is, there exists a measure μ_{inv} on $\mathcal{S}'(\Sigma)_{inv}$ and $\mu_\perp$ on $\mathcal{S}'(\Sigma)_\perp$, unique up to rescaling, such that $\mu = \mu_{inv} \times \mu_\perp$. If we furthermore require $\Pi_*\mu = \mu_{inv}$, this rescaling freedom is fixed, in which case, by Lemma 4.3 above, μ_{inv} is precisely μ_{red} .*

It follows that

$$L^2(\mathcal{S}'(\Sigma), d\mu) = L^2(\mathcal{S}'(\Sigma)_{inv}, d\mu_{red}) \otimes L^2(\mathcal{S}'(\Sigma)_\perp, d\mu_\perp) \quad (4.1)$$

so that if we define $\mathcal{H}_\perp := L^2(\mathcal{S}'(\Sigma)_\perp, d\mu_\perp)$,

$$\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_{red} \otimes \mathcal{H}_\perp. \quad (4.2)$$

Theorem 4.6. *In terms of this tensor product structure of $\mathcal{H}$, the Hamiltonian operator for the free scalar field theory takes the form*

$$\hat{\mathbb{H}} = \hat{\mathbb{H}}_{red} \otimes \mathbb{1} + \mathbb{1} \otimes \hat{\mathbb{H}}_\perp \quad (4.3)$$

where

$$\hat{\mathbb{H}}_{red} = \int d^3x \left\{ (\Theta^{\frac{1}{2}}\varphi_s)(x) \frac{\delta}{\delta\varphi_s(x)} - \frac{1}{2} \frac{\delta^2}{\delta\varphi_s(x)^2} \right\} \quad (4.4)$$

is the Hamiltonian of the reduced theory (see appendix A) and ⁸

$$\hat{\mathbb{H}}_\perp = \int d^3x \left\{ (\Theta^{\frac{1}{2}}\varphi_\perp)(x) \frac{\delta}{\delta\varphi_\perp(x)} - \frac{1}{2} \frac{\delta^2}{\delta\varphi_\perp(x)^2} \right\} \quad (4.5)$$

That is, the Hamiltonian is separable over the tensor product decomposition of $\mathcal{H}$. With these structures established, we proceed with an analysis of Cyl_A^* and $\mathcal{H}_B$.

⁸ In this paper, $\frac{\delta}{\delta\varphi}$, $\frac{\delta}{\delta\varphi_s}$, and $\frac{\delta}{\delta\varphi_\perp}$ are defined with respect to the volume form $d^3x := \rho d\rho dz d\phi$. In the reduced theory, in appendix (A), $\frac{\delta}{\delta\varphi_r}$ is defined with respect to $d^2x := d\rho dz$.

5. ANALYSIS OF Cyl_A^*

It will be useful to first prove the precise way in which Cyl_A^* is the space of all elements of Cyl^* with support in $\mathcal{S}'(\Sigma)_{\text{inv}}$.

Define $\text{Cyl}_\sim := \{\Psi \in \text{Cyl} \mid \text{Supp } \Psi \cap \mathcal{S}'(\Sigma)_{\text{inv}} = \emptyset\}$. Then we say $\eta \in \text{Cyl}^*$ has support on $\mathcal{S}'(\Sigma)_{\text{inv}}$ if η is zero on $\text{Cyl}_\sim$.

Lemma 5.1. *For $\Psi \in \text{Cyl}$, $\Psi \in \text{Cyl}_\sim$ iff Ψ is of the form $\sum_{i=1}^n \varphi(\mathcal{L}_\phi f_i) \Phi_i$ for some $\{f_i\} \subset \mathcal{S}(\Sigma)$ and some $\{\Phi_i\} \subset \text{Cyl}$.*

Proof.

($\Leftarrow$) obvious.

($\Rightarrow$) Suppose $\Psi \in \text{Cyl}_\sim$. As an element of Cyl , $\Psi[\varphi]$ depends on φ only via a finite number of “probes” (see section 2). There is an ambiguity in how one chooses the probes; what is important is the finite dimensional subspace of $\mathcal{S}(\Sigma)$ spanned by these probes. Let V denote this finite dimensional subspace. We may then choose any set of probes spanning V to represent Ψ as a cylindrical function. Using the decomposition $\mathcal{S}(\Sigma) = \mathcal{S}(\Sigma)_{\text{inv}} \oplus \mathcal{S}(\Sigma)_\perp$ (see section 4), we demand that our choice of probes spanning V be a set of the form $\{\mathcal{L}_\phi f_1, \dots, \mathcal{L}_\phi f_n, e_1, \dots, e_m\}$ where $\mathcal{L}_\phi f_1, \dots, \mathcal{L}_\phi f_n$ are all in $\mathcal{S}(\Sigma)_\perp$ and $e_1, \dots, e_m$ are all in $\mathcal{S}(\Sigma)_{\text{inv}}$.

Then Ψ may be written

$$\Psi[\varphi] = F(\varphi(\mathcal{L}_\phi f_1), \dots, \varphi(\mathcal{L}_\phi f_n), \varphi(e_1), \dots, \varphi(e_m)) \quad (5.1)$$

for some smooth F . Because $\Psi \in \text{Cyl}_\sim$ it follows that $F(0, \dots, 0, y_1, \dots, y_m) = 0$ for all $y_1, \dots, y_m$. For each $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, define

$$G_i(x_1, \dots, x_n, y_1, \dots, y_m) := \frac{F(0, \dots, 0, x_i, \dots, y_m) - F(0, \dots, 0, x_{i+1}, \dots, y_m)}{x_i} \quad (5.2)$$

Since F is smooth, it follows that all the G_i are smooth. The G_i 's thus determine elements of Cyl :

$$\Phi_i[\varphi] := G_i(\varphi(\mathcal{L}_\phi f_1), \dots, \varphi(\mathcal{L}_\phi f_n), \varphi(e_1), \dots, \varphi(e_m)) \quad (5.3)$$

One can also show

$$F \equiv \sum_{i=1}^n x_i G_i \quad (5.4)$$

It therefore follows that

$$\Psi[\varphi] = \sum_{i=1}^n \varphi(\mathcal{L}_\phi f_i) \Phi_i \quad (5.5)$$

proving the desired form. $\square$

It then easily follows that

Theorem 5.2.

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Cyl}_A^* &= \{\eta \in \text{Cyl}^* \mid \eta(\Psi) = 0 \quad \forall \Psi \in \text{Cyl}_\sim\} \\ \text{i.e.} \quad \text{Cyl}_A^* &= \{\eta \in \text{Cyl}^* \mid \text{Supp } \eta \subseteq \mathcal{S}'(\Sigma)_{\text{inv}}\} \end{aligned} \quad (5.6)$$

Proof.

($\subseteq$)

Suppose $\hat{\varphi}(\mathcal{L}_\phi f)^* \eta = 0$ for all f . Then $\eta(\varphi(\mathcal{L}_\phi f)\Phi) = 0$ for all $f \in \mathcal{S}(\Sigma)$ and $\Phi \in \text{Cyl}$, whence

$$\eta \left(\sum_{i=1}^n \varphi(\mathcal{L}_\phi f_i) \Phi_i \right) = 0 \quad (5.7)$$

for all $\{f_i\} \subset \mathcal{S}(\Sigma)$ and $\{\Phi_i\} \subset \text{Cyl}$. The above lemma then implies η is zero on $\text{Cyl}_\sim$.

($\supseteq$)

Suppose $\eta \in \text{Cyl}^*$ is zero on $\text{Cyl}_\sim$. Then by the lemma, in particular $\eta(\varphi(\mathcal{L}_\phi f)\Phi) = 0$ for all $f \in \mathcal{S}(\Sigma)$ and $\Phi \in \text{Cyl}$, whence $\eta \in \text{Cyl}_A^*$. $\square$

Thus, in a precise sense, Cyl_A^* is the subspace of Cyl^* consisting in elements with support only on symmetric configurations.

Next, let us construct an embedding of the Hilbert space of the reduced theory, $\mathcal{H}_{red}$, in Cyl_A^* .

For $\Psi \in \mathcal{H}_{red}$, define $\mathfrak{E}(\Psi) \in \text{Cyl}^*$ by

$$\mathfrak{E}(\Psi)[\Phi] := \langle \Psi, \Phi \circ I^{-1} \rangle. \quad (5.8)$$

$\mathfrak{E} : \mathcal{H}_{red} \rightarrow \text{Cyl}^*$ is then manifestly anti-linear.

Note that for $\Phi = \Phi_{red} \otimes \Phi_\perp \in \text{Cyl}$, with $\Phi_{red} \in \mathcal{H}_{red}$ and $\Phi_\perp \in \mathcal{H}_\perp$, $\Phi \circ I^{-1} = \Phi_\perp[0]\Phi_{red}$, so that in this case, (5.8) can be rewritten

$$\mathfrak{E}(\Psi)[\Phi] = \langle \Psi, \Phi_{red} \rangle \Phi_\perp[0] \quad (5.9)$$

Thus, using the standard embedding of $\mathcal{H}_{red}$ into Cyl_{red}^* using the inner product, the action of $\mathfrak{E}$ may equivalently be written

$$\mathfrak{E}(\Psi) = \Psi^* \otimes \delta, \quad (5.10)$$

where $\delta : \Phi_\perp \mapsto \Phi_\perp[0]$ is the Dirac measure, and the meaning of the notation on the right hand side is clear from (5.9). It will be convenient in this section to let $\text{Cyl}_\perp$ denote the space of cylindrical functions on $\mathcal{S}'(\Sigma)_\perp$; then $\delta \in \text{Cyl}_\perp^*$.

Note that (5.10) makes it manifest that $\mathfrak{E}$ is one to one and is an embedding of $\mathcal{H}_{red}$ in Cyl^* . Furthermore,

Theorem 5.3. *The image of $\mathfrak{E}$ is contained in Cyl_A^* .*

Proof.

For all $\Psi \in \mathcal{H}_{red}$, $f \in \mathcal{S}(\Sigma)$, and $\Phi \in \text{Cyl}$,

$$\mathfrak{E}(\Psi)(\hat{\varphi}[\mathcal{L}_\phi f]\Phi) = \langle \Psi, (\hat{\varphi}[\mathcal{L}_\phi f]\Phi) \circ I^{-1} \rangle \quad (5.11)$$

Now, for $\varphi \in \mathcal{S}'(\Sigma)_{inv}$,

$$(\hat{\varphi}[\mathcal{L}_\phi f]\Phi)[\varphi] = \varphi(\mathcal{L}_\phi f)\Phi[\varphi] = 0 \quad (5.12)$$

whence $(\hat{\varphi}[\mathcal{L}_\phi f]\Phi) \circ I^{-1} = 0$ for all $\Phi \in \text{Cyl}$. So

$$\mathfrak{E}(\Psi)(\hat{\varphi}[\mathcal{L}_\phi f]\Phi) = 0 \quad \forall \Phi \in \text{Cyl}, f \in \mathcal{S}(\Sigma) \quad (5.13)$$

whence

$$\hat{\varphi}[\mathcal{L}_\phi f]^* \mathfrak{E}(\Psi) = 0 \quad \forall f. \quad (5.14)$$

so that $\mathfrak{E}(\Psi) \in \text{Cyl}_A^*$ for all $\Psi \in \mathcal{H}_{red}$. $\square$

Thus $\mathfrak{E}$ gives an anti-linear embedding of $\mathcal{H}_{red}$ in Cyl_A^* . Let the image of this embedding be denoted $\mathcal{H}_A$.

Theorem 5.4. $\mathcal{H}_A \subsetneq \text{Cyl}_{inv}^*$.⁹

Proof.

First we prove $\mathcal{H}_A \subseteq \text{Cyl}_{inv}^*$.

For all $\Psi \in \mathcal{H}_{red}$, $g \in \mathcal{T}$, and $\Phi \in \text{Cyl}$,

$$\begin{aligned} (g \cdot \mathfrak{E}(\Psi))(\Phi) &:= \mathfrak{E}(\Psi)(g^{-1} \cdot \Phi) \\ &= \langle \Psi, (g^{-1} \cdot \Phi) \circ I^{-1} \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (5.15)$$

Now, for all $f \in \mathcal{S}'(B)$,

$$\begin{aligned} ((g^{-1} \cdot \Phi) \circ I^{-1})[f] &:= (g^{-1} \cdot \Phi)[I^{-1}(f)] := \Phi[g \cdot (I^{-1}(f))] \\ &= \Phi[I^{-1}(f)] = (\Phi \circ I^{-1})[f] \end{aligned} \quad (5.16)$$

whence $(g^{-1} \cdot \Phi) \circ I^{-1} = \Phi \circ I^{-1}$, and

$$(g \cdot \mathfrak{E}(\Psi))(\Phi) = \langle \Psi, \Phi \circ I^{-1} \rangle = \mathfrak{E}(\Psi)(\Phi) \quad (5.17)$$

whence $\mathfrak{E}(\Psi) \in \text{Cyl}_{inv}^*$ for all $\Psi \in \mathcal{H}_{red}$.

Next, to show $\mathcal{H}_A \subsetneq \text{Cyl}_{inv}^*$, we construct an element of Cyl_{inv}^* that is not in $\mathcal{H}_A$.

To facilitate explicit calculation, let us choose

$$f(\rho, z, \phi) := H(\rho, z) \sin \phi \quad (5.18)$$

where $H(\rho, z)$ is any non-negative, non-zero, smooth function of compact support such that all derivatives of H vanish at $\rho = 0$ (to ensure smoothness of f at the axis).

Define $\alpha \in \mathcal{S}'(\Sigma)$ by

$$\alpha(h) := \int_{\Sigma} (hf) d^3x \quad (5.19)$$

Then define $\eta \in \text{Cyl}^*$ by

$$\eta(\Phi) := \int_{g \in \mathcal{T}} \Phi[g \cdot \alpha] dg. \quad (5.20)$$

so that $\eta \in \text{Cyl}_{inv}^*$.

To show $\eta \notin \mathcal{H}_A$, we construct an element Φ of $\text{Cyl}_{\sim}$ such that $\eta(\Phi) \neq 0$.

Let $F(x) := x^2$, so that F is smooth, zero only at zero, and positive everywhere else. Define $\Phi \in \text{Cyl}$ by

$$\Phi[\varphi] := F(\varphi(\mathcal{L}_\phi f)) \quad (5.21)$$

⁹ Ideally one would have liked to prove the stronger result $\text{Cyl}_A^* \subsetneq \text{Cyl}_{inv}^*$: but in fact one does not even have $\text{Cyl}_A^* \subseteq \text{Cyl}_{inv}^*$. One has to restrict to $\mathcal{H}_A$ before one has a subspace of Cyl_{inv}^* . This reminds us of the importance of restricting to appropriately defined normalizable states before expecting certain properties to hold.

so that Φ is in $\text{Cyl}_\sim$.

We have

$$\eta(\Phi) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\phi'=0}^{2\pi} F(\alpha(g(-\phi') \cdot \mathcal{L}_\phi f)) d\phi' \quad (5.22)$$

where we have parametrized the group of rotations $\mathcal{T}$ in the usual way by $\phi' \in \frac{\mathbb{R}}{2\pi\mathbb{Z}}$. Working out the expression further, we get

$$\eta(\Phi) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\phi'=0}^{2\pi} F(-a\pi \sin \phi') d\phi' \quad (5.23)$$

where $a := \int_B H(\rho, z)^2 \rho d\rho dz > 0$. Since the above integrand is positive almost everywhere, $\eta(\Phi) > 0$.

Thus $\eta \notin \text{Cyl}_A^*$, proving in particular $\eta \notin \mathcal{H}_A$, so that $\mathcal{H}_A \subsetneq \text{Cyl}_{inv}^*$. $\square$

Lastly, we make some remarks as to the (dual) action of the Hamiltonian $\hat{\mathbb{H}}$ and the lack of preservation of the A-symmetric sector by $\hat{\mathbb{H}}^*$. As mentioned earlier, $\hat{\mathbb{H}}$ in (2.42) preserves Cyl ; thus it has a dual action $\hat{\mathbb{H}}^*$ on Cyl^* . We will show that, as expected from the classical analysis (see section 3 A), $\hat{\mathbb{H}}^*$ does not preserve $\mathcal{H}_A$. In fact, this lack of preservation is maximal: $\hat{\mathbb{H}}^*$ maps every (non-zero) element of $\mathcal{H}_A$ out of $\mathcal{H}_A$. We proceed to prove this, starting with a lemma.

Lemma 5.5. $\delta \in \text{Cyl}_\perp^*$ is not an eigenstate of $\hat{\mathbb{H}}_\perp^*$.

Proof.

Let $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ be given. We will show $\hat{\mathbb{H}}^* \delta \neq \lambda \delta$.

Let e be any non-zero element of $\mathcal{S}(\Sigma)_\perp$. Let a be any complex number not equal to $\frac{-\lambda}{(e,e)}$.

Define $\Phi \in \text{Cyl}_\perp$ by

$$\Phi[\varphi] := 1 + a(\varphi(e))^2 \quad (5.24)$$

Then, performing an explicit calculation,

$$(\hat{\mathbb{H}}_\perp^* \delta)(\Phi) = \delta(\hat{\mathbb{H}}_\perp \Phi) = -a(e, e) \quad (5.25)$$

but

$$\lambda \delta(\Phi) = \lambda \quad (5.26)$$

so that $(\hat{\mathbb{H}}_\perp^* \delta)(\Phi) \neq \lambda \delta(\Phi)$, proving $\hat{\mathbb{H}}_\perp^* \delta \neq \lambda \delta$ for all $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$. $\square$

Theorem 5.6. $\hat{\mathbb{H}}^*$ maps every (non-zero) element of $\mathcal{H}_A$ out of $\mathcal{H}_A$.

Proof.

We use the fact that $\mathcal{H}_A = \mathcal{H}_{red} \otimes \delta$ (5.10) and we use theorem (4.6). For $\Psi \otimes \delta \in \mathcal{H}_A$,

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\mathbb{H}}^*(\Psi \otimes \delta) &= (\hat{\mathbb{H}}_{red}^* \otimes \mathbb{1} + \mathbb{1} \otimes \hat{\mathbb{H}}_\perp^*)(\Psi \otimes \delta) \\ &= (\hat{\mathbb{H}}_{red}^* \Psi) \otimes \delta + \Psi \otimes (\hat{\mathbb{H}}_\perp^* \delta). \end{aligned} \quad (5.27)$$

However, as proven in the above lemma, $\hat{\mathbb{H}}_\perp^* \delta$ is not again proportional to δ , whence $\hat{\mathbb{H}}^*(\Psi \otimes \delta)$ is not again in $\mathcal{H}_A$. $\square$

In essence, then, the reason $\hat{\mathbb{H}}^*$ fails to preserve $\mathcal{H}_A$ is that δ is not an eigenstate of $\hat{\mathbb{H}}^*$.

It is additionally worthwhile to note that $\hat{\mathbb{H}}^*$ also fails to preserve the larger space Cyl_A^* . This can be seen as follows. Let $\eta \in \text{Cyl}^*$ be of the form $\eta(\Phi) := \Phi[\alpha]$ for some non-zero $\alpha \in \mathcal{S}'(\Sigma)_{\text{inv}}$. One can show from (3.4c) and (2.42) that $\eta \in \text{Cyl}_A^*$ but $\hat{\mathbb{H}}^*\eta \notin \text{Cyl}_A^*$. Thus $\hat{\mathbb{H}}^*$ fails to preserve Cyl_A^* in addition to failing to preserve $\mathcal{H}_A$.

6. ANALYSIS OF $\mathcal{H}_B$

We next analyze the structure and properties of $\mathcal{H}_B$, helping us to (further) grasp its physical meaning in different ways.

A. Reformulations of $\mathcal{H}_B$ inspired by Fock space structure

We begin with a first reformulation of $\mathcal{H}_B$ shedding additional light on its meaning. Let h_{inv} denote the $\mathcal{T}$ -invariant subspace of the single particle Hilbert space h , and let $h_{\text{inv}}^\perp$ denote its orthogonal complement.

Theorem 6.1. *Suppose $\psi^{A_1 \dots A_n} \in \bigotimes_s^n h$. Then*

$$\bar{\xi}_{A_1} \psi^{A_1 \dots A_n} = 0 \quad \forall \xi \in h_{\text{inv}}^\perp \quad (6.1)$$

iff

$$\psi^{A_1 \dots A_n} \in \bigotimes_s^n h_{\text{inv}} \quad (6.2)$$

Proof.

($\Leftarrow$): obvious.

($\Rightarrow$):

Let $\{v_i\}_{i \in I}$ be an orthonormal basis of h_{inv} and $\{v_i\}_{i \in J}$ an orthonormal basis of $h_{\text{inv}}^\perp$, so that $\{v_i\}_{i \in I \cup J}$ is a basis of h . Decomposing $\psi^{A_1 \dots A_n}$ with respect to this basis,

$$\psi^{A_1 \dots A_n} =: \sum_{i_1 \dots i_n \in I \cup J} \psi^{i_1 \dots i_n} v_{i_1}^{A_1} \dots v_{i_n}^{A_n}. \quad (6.3)$$

Suppose (6.1) holds, so that

$$\sum_{i_1, \dots, i_n \in I \cup J} \psi^{i_1 \dots i_n} \bar{\xi}_{A_1} v_{i_1}^{A_1} \dots v_{i_n}^{A_n} = 0 \quad \forall \xi \in h_{\text{inv}}^\perp. \quad (6.4)$$

Suppose $\{j_1, \dots, j_n\} \not\subseteq I$. Without loss of generality assume $j_1 \notin I$. Applying (6.4) in the case $\xi = v_{j_1}$ gives

$$\sum_{i_2, \dots, i_n \in I \cup J} \psi^{j_1, i_2 \dots i_n} v_{i_2}^{A_2} \dots v_{i_n}^{A_n} = 0 \quad (6.5)$$

The linear independence of the products of basis vectors in this expression implies $\psi^{j_1 \dots j_n} = 0$. Thus $\psi^{j_1 \dots j_n} = 0$ for all $\{j_1, \dots, j_n\} \not\subseteq I$, whence, from (6.3), $\psi^{A_1 \dots A_n} \in \bigotimes_s^n h_{\text{inv}}$. $\square$

It then follows trivially from the definition of $\mathcal{H}_B$, the creation operators, annihilation operators and Ψ_0 that

Corollary 6.2. $\mathcal{H}_B = \text{span}\{a^\dagger(\xi_1) \cdots a^\dagger(\xi_n) \Psi_0 \mid \xi_1, \dots, \xi_n \in h_{inv}\}$ where Ψ_0 is the Fock vacuum.

(Here, as throughout this paper, the span is understood to mean the Cauchy completion of finite linear combinations of elements of a given set.) This gives us our first reformulation of $\mathcal{H}_B$; it tells us that $\mathcal{H}_B$ is the space of states in which *all non-symmetric modes are unexcited*. (In the language of [12] the non-symmetric modes are “quantum mechanically suppressed.”)

Next recall that, in free Klein-Gordon theory, with each $\xi \in h$ one has an associated (normalized) *coherent state* $\Psi_\xi^{coh} \in \mathcal{H}$ defined by

$$\Psi_\xi^{coh} = e^{\hat{\Lambda}(\xi)} \Psi_0 \quad (6.6)$$

where $\hat{\Lambda}(\xi) := a^\dagger(\xi) - a(\xi)$.

In the case where $\xi \in \Gamma \subset h$, Ψ_ξ^{coh} has the interpretation of being the quantum state that “best approximates” the classical state ξ . The expectation values of field operators determined by Ψ_ξ^{coh} are precisely the values of the fields in ξ , and uncertainties in appropriate field components are minimized.

Theorem 6.3. $\mathcal{H}_B = \text{span}\{\Psi_\xi^{coh} \mid \xi \in h_{inv}\}$

Proof.

Let $\mathcal{H}_s^{coh} := \text{span}\{\Psi_\xi^{coh} \mid \xi \in h_{inv}\}$.

For all $\xi \in h_{inv}$,

$$\begin{aligned} e^{\hat{\Lambda}(\xi)} \Psi_0 &= e^{(a^\dagger(\xi) - a(\xi))} \Psi_0 \\ &= e^{a^\dagger(\xi)} e^{-a(\xi)} e^{-\frac{1}{2}\langle \xi, \xi \rangle} \Psi_0 \\ &= e^{-\frac{1}{2}\langle \xi, \xi \rangle} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n!} (a^\dagger(\xi))^n \Psi_0 \end{aligned} \quad (6.7)$$

which is in $\mathcal{H}_B$ by corollary 6.2. Thus $\mathcal{H}_s^{coh} \subseteq \mathcal{H}_B$

Going in the other direction, for all $\xi_1, \dots, \xi_n \in h_{inv}$,

$$\begin{aligned} a^\dagger(\xi_1) \cdots a^\dagger(\xi_n) \Psi_0 &= \left. \frac{d}{d\lambda_1} \right|_{\lambda_1=0} \cdots \left. \frac{d}{d\lambda_n} \right|_{\lambda_n=0} e^{a^\dagger(\lambda_1 \xi_1 + \cdots + \lambda_n \xi_n)} \Psi_0 \\ &= \left. \frac{d}{d\lambda_1} \right|_{\lambda_1=0} \cdots \left. \frac{d}{d\lambda_n} \right|_{\lambda_n=0} e^{\frac{1}{2}\|\lambda_1 \xi_1 + \cdots + \lambda_n \xi_n\|^2} e^{\hat{\Lambda}(\lambda_1 \xi_1 + \cdots + \lambda_n \xi_n)} \Psi_0 \end{aligned} \quad (6.8)$$

which is a limit of linear combinations of symmetric coherent states, whence it is in $\mathcal{H}_s^{coh}$, so that $\mathcal{H}_B \subseteq \mathcal{H}_s^{coh}$. $\square$

Note that because Γ_{inv} is dense in h_{inv} and $\xi \mapsto \Psi_\xi^{coh}$ is continuous¹⁰ one can replace h_{inv} with Γ_{inv} in the statement of the above theorem. The theorem then expresses $\mathcal{H}_B$ as a span of coherent states associated with the axisymmetric sector of the strictly classical theory.

¹⁰ The continuity of $\xi \mapsto \Psi_\xi^{coh}$ can be seen from the relation

$$\|\Psi_\xi^{coh} - \Psi_{\xi_i}^{coh}\|^2 = 2 - 2 \cos(\text{Im}\langle \xi, \xi_i \rangle) e^{-\frac{1}{2}\|\xi - \xi_i\|^2}$$

If $\xi_i \rightarrow \xi$, from the continuity in ξ_i of the right hand side of the above equation, $\Psi_{\xi_i}^{coh} \rightarrow \Psi_\xi^{coh}$.

As a side note, it is not hard to show that Ψ_ξ^{coh} satisfies the usual property of being a simultaneous eigenstate of the annihilation operators:

$$a(\eta)\Psi_\xi^{coh} = \langle \eta, \xi \rangle \Psi_\xi^{coh} \quad (6.9)$$

One can use this property to prove theorem (6.3) in an alternative way.

B. Reformulations of $\mathcal{H}_B$ inspired by the structure $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_{red} \otimes \mathcal{H}_\perp$; natural isomorphism between $\mathcal{H}_{red}$ and $\mathcal{H}_B$

Theorem 6.4. *In terms of the structure $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_{red} \otimes \mathcal{H}_\perp$,*

$$\mathcal{H}_B = \{\Upsilon \otimes 1 \mid \Upsilon \in \mathcal{H}_{red}\}. \quad (6.10)$$

Proof.

We first show that, in terms of $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_{red} \otimes \mathcal{H}_\perp$, for $[f, g] \in h_{inv}$, $a^\dagger([f, g]) = \sqrt{2\pi} a_{red}^\dagger([f, \rho g]) \otimes \mathbb{1}$, where $a_{red}^\dagger(\cdot)$ is the creation operator in the reduced theory and ρ is the spatial coordinate that is distance from the z-axis.

From (2.37), for $[f, g] \in h_{inv}$ and $\Psi \in \mathcal{H}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} a^\dagger([f, g])\Psi[\varphi] &= \int_\Sigma d^3x \left\{ \left(\Theta^{\frac{1}{2}} f + i g \right) \varphi - \frac{1}{2} \left(f + i \Theta^{-\frac{1}{2}} g \right) \frac{\delta}{\delta \varphi} \right\} \Psi[\varphi] \\ &= \int_\Sigma d^3x \left\{ \left(\Theta^{\frac{1}{2}} f + i g \right) \varphi_s - \frac{1}{2} \left(f + i \Theta^{-\frac{1}{2}} g \right) \frac{\delta}{\delta \varphi_s} \right\} \Psi[\varphi] \\ &= (2\pi) \int_B d^2x \rho \left\{ \left(\Theta^{\frac{1}{2}} f + i g \right) \varphi_s - \frac{1}{2} \left(f + i \Theta^{-\frac{1}{2}} g \right) \frac{\delta}{\delta \varphi_s} \right\} \Psi[\varphi] \end{aligned} \quad (6.11)$$

Using equations (A.2), (A.32) and (A.16),

$$\begin{aligned} a^\dagger([f, g])\Psi[\varphi] &= \sqrt{2\pi} \left\{ \int_B d^2x \left(\rho \Theta^{\frac{1}{2}} f + i \rho g \right) \varphi_r - \frac{1}{2} \int_B d^2x \left(f + i \Theta^{-\frac{1}{2}} g \right) \frac{\delta}{\delta \varphi_r} \right\} \Psi[\varphi] \\ &= \sqrt{2\pi} \left\{ \varphi_r \left[\rho \Theta^{\frac{1}{2}} f + i \rho g \right] - \frac{1}{2} \int_B d^2x \left(f + i \Theta^{-\frac{1}{2}} g \right) \frac{\delta}{\delta \varphi_r} \right\} \Psi[\varphi] \\ &= \left(\sqrt{2\pi} a_{red}^\dagger([f, \rho g]) \otimes \mathbb{1} \right) \Psi[\varphi] \end{aligned} \quad (6.12)$$

where the ρ and 2π factors arise from our conventions in (A.2).

Using this,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}_B &= \text{span} \left\{ a^\dagger([f_1, g_1]) \cdots a^\dagger([f_n, g_n]) (1 \otimes 1) \right\}_{\substack{f_1, \dots, f_n, \\ g_1, \dots, g_n \in \mathcal{S}(\Sigma)_{inv}}} \\ &= \text{span} \left\{ \left((2\pi)^{\frac{n}{2}} a_{red}^\dagger([f_1, \rho g_1]) \cdots a_{red}^\dagger([f_n, \rho g_n]) 1 \right) \otimes 1 \right\}_{\substack{f_1, \dots, f_n, \\ g_1, \dots, g_n \in \mathcal{S}(B)}} \\ &= \text{span} \left\{ a_{red}^\dagger([f_1, \rho g_1]) \cdots a_{red}^\dagger([f_n, \rho g_n]) 1 \right\}_{\substack{f_1, \dots, f_n, \\ g_1, \dots, g_n \in \mathcal{S}(B)}} \otimes 1 \\ &= \mathcal{H}_{red} \otimes 1 \end{aligned} \quad (6.13)$$

□

From this it is obvious that $\mathcal{H}_B$ and $\mathcal{H}_{red}$ are naturally isomorphic.

Note that, in contrast to the δ in (5.10), 1 is an eigenfunction of $\hat{\mathbb{H}}_\perp$: 1 is the unique vacuum of $\hat{\mathbb{H}}_\perp$. A number of important conclusions follow from this fact.

1. First, Using (4.3), it is now easy to see that $\hat{\mathbb{H}}$ preserves $\mathcal{H}_B$. Because $\hat{\mathbb{H}}$ preserves $\mathcal{H}_B$, it induces, via the isomorphism between $\mathcal{H}_B$ and $\mathcal{H}_{red}$, an operator on $\mathcal{H}_{red}$. It is easy to see that this induced Hamiltonian on $\mathcal{H}_{red}$ is just $\hat{\mathbb{H}}_{red}$, so that everything is consistent.
2. Because 1 is the vacuum of $\hat{\mathbb{H}}_\perp$, the above theorem gives another expression of the fact that $\mathcal{H}_B$ is the space of states in which “all non-symmetric modes are unexcited”.
3. Because 1 is the unique eigenstate of $\mathbb{1} \otimes \hat{\mathbb{H}}_\perp$ with eigenvalue zero, the above theorem implies

$$\mathcal{H}_B = \text{Ker} \left(\mathbb{1} \otimes \hat{\mathbb{H}}_\perp \right) \quad (6.14)$$

Thus, $\mathbb{1} \otimes \hat{\mathbb{H}}_\perp$ by itself could have been taken as the sole constraint.

The significance of the last point is the following. One can cast $\hat{\mathbb{H}}_\perp$ as a quadratic combination of the *original second class set of self-adjoint constraint operators* (equation (3.3)). This in turn makes this way of imposing the (ideal) constraints (3.3) an instance of Klauder’s universal procedure for imposing constraints (with ‘ δ ’ being set to zero; see [8]).

Let us show this. First let $\{f_i\}$ denote any basis of $\mathcal{S}(\Sigma)_\perp$ orthonormal with respect to $(\cdot, \Theta^{\frac{1}{2}} \cdot)$. Then $\{\xi_i := (f_i, \Theta^{\frac{1}{2}} f_i)\}$ is an orthonormal basis of $h_\perp$, the orthogonal complement of the axisymmetric subspace in the single particle Hilbert space h (as one can check). Define

$$\hat{\eta}_{[i,0]} := \hat{\varphi}[f_i] \quad (6.15)$$

$$\hat{\eta}_{[i,1]} := \hat{\pi}[f_i]. \quad (6.16)$$

so that $\{\hat{\eta}_{[i,A]}\}$ is a basis of the full original set of constraint operators (3.3). Define the matrix

$$M^{[i,A],[j,B]} := \alpha^{AB} \langle \xi_i, \hat{H} \xi_j \rangle = \alpha^{AB} (f_i, \Theta f_j) \quad (6.17)$$

where $\alpha^{AB} := \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & i \\ -i & 1 \end{pmatrix}$. It is not hard to check that M is Hermitian and positive definite. We have

$$\mathbb{1} \otimes \hat{\mathbb{H}}_\perp = \sum_{[i,A],[j,B]} M^{[i,A],[j,B]} \hat{\eta}_{[i,A]} \hat{\eta}_{[j,B]} \quad (6.18)$$

casting $\mathbb{1} \otimes \hat{\mathbb{H}}_\perp$ in the desired form.

Additionally from theorem 6.4, it is also easy to see

Corollary 6.5. $\mathcal{H}_B \subsetneq \mathcal{H}_{inv}$.

Proof.

That $\mathcal{H}_B \subseteq \mathcal{H}_{inv}$ is immediate from theorem (6.4) and the fact that the symmetry group $\mathcal{T}$ acts non-trivially only on the second factor in $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_{red} \otimes \mathcal{H}_\perp$.

To show that furthermore $\mathcal{H}_B \subsetneq \mathcal{H}_{inv}$ note that there exist non-constant $\mathcal{T}$ -symmetric elements of $\mathcal{H}_\perp$. If α is one of these elements of $\mathcal{H}_\perp$, and $\psi \in \mathcal{H}_{red}$ arbitrary and

non-zero, $\psi \otimes \alpha$ is in $\mathcal{H}_{inv}$ but not $\mathcal{H}_B$. $\square$

In addition to the example used in the proof above, one can also give a more “concrete” example of an element of $\mathcal{H}_{inv}$ that is not in $\mathcal{H}_B$: a two particle state in which the two particles are in z-angular momentum eigenstates with equal and opposite eigenvalue (i.e. “spin up” and “spin down” eigenstates). It is easy to see that such a state is in $\mathcal{H}_{inv}$: its total z-angular momentum is zero and so it is annihilated by $\hat{\mathbb{L}}_z$. It is also not too hard to show it is not in $\mathcal{H}_B$.

C. Minimization of fluctuations from axisymmetry

A last notable property of $\mathcal{H}_B$ is that the fluctuations from axisymmetry in its members are under complete control and are in a certain sense *minimized*, whereas in $\mathcal{H}_{inv}$ there is no control over fluctuations from axisymmetry.

Let us be more precise. Recall ideally one may wish to impose $\mathcal{L}_\phi \hat{\varphi}(x) \Psi = 0$ and $\mathcal{L}_\phi \hat{\pi}(x) \Psi = 0$, but that, in this form, this is not possible. Therefore we imposed instead a complex linear combination of these constraints (in approach B). Nevertheless, the resulting states $\Psi \in \mathcal{H}_B$ are still such that

$$\langle \Psi, \mathcal{L}_\phi \hat{\varphi}(x) \Psi \rangle = 0 \quad (6.19)$$

$$\langle \Psi, \mathcal{L}_\phi \hat{\pi}(x) \Psi \rangle = 0 \quad (6.20)$$

that is, the expectation values of $\hat{\varphi}(x)$ and $\hat{\pi}(x)$ are axisymmetric. The easiest way to see this is actually to first note that $\mathcal{H}_B \subset \mathcal{H}_{inv}$ and then show that (6.19) and (6.20) hold for *all* members of $\mathcal{H}_{inv}$. One can show this using the fact that for all rotations g , $\hat{\varphi}(g \cdot x) = U_g \hat{\varphi}(x) U_g^{-1}$.

Thus both $\mathcal{H}_B$ and $\mathcal{H}_{inv}$ consist in states giving rise to axisymmetric field expectation values. The difference between $\mathcal{H}_B$ and $\mathcal{H}_{inv}$ comes, however, when we consider *fluctuations* from axisymmetry.

To show this, it will be convenient to first note that if $\varphi_s(x), \varphi_\perp(x)$ denote the symmetric and non-symmetric parts of $\varphi(x)$, and $\pi_s(x), \pi_\perp(x)$ denote the symmetric and non-symmetric parts of $\pi(x)$, so that $\hat{\varphi}_s(x), \hat{\pi}_s(x)$ are operators on $\mathcal{H}_{red}$ and $\hat{\varphi}_\perp(x), \hat{\pi}_\perp(x)$ are operators on $\mathcal{H}_\perp$, we have

$$\hat{\varphi}(x) = \hat{\varphi}_s(x) \otimes \mathbb{1} + \mathbb{1} \otimes \hat{\varphi}_\perp(x) \quad (6.21)$$

$$\hat{\pi}(x) = \hat{\pi}_s(x) \otimes \mathbb{1} + \mathbb{1} \otimes \hat{\pi}_\perp(x) \quad (6.22)$$

For any operator $\hat{O}$ on $\mathcal{H}$ and $\Psi \in \mathcal{H}$, the “fluctuation” in $\hat{O}$ determined by Ψ is defined by

$$\Delta_\Psi \hat{O} := \sqrt{\langle \Psi, \hat{O}^2 \Psi \rangle - \langle \Psi, \hat{O} \Psi \rangle^2} \quad (6.23)$$

Smearing the symmetry constraint operators against a test function f , we get $\hat{\varphi}[\mathcal{L}_\phi f]$ and $\hat{\pi}[\mathcal{L}_\phi f]$. For $\Psi = \Upsilon \otimes 1 \in \mathcal{H}_B$, with unit norm, one can show the uncertainties in the non-axisymmetric modes are given by

$$\Delta_\Psi \hat{\varphi}[\mathcal{L}_\phi f] = \sqrt{\frac{1}{2} \int d^3x (\mathcal{L}_\phi f) \Theta^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{L}_\phi f} \quad (6.24)$$

$$\Delta_\Psi \hat{\pi}[\mathcal{L}_\phi f] = \sqrt{\frac{1}{2} \int d^3x (\mathcal{L}_\phi f) \Theta^{\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{L}_\phi f} \quad (6.25)$$

In particular, for f an eigenfunction of Θ ,

$$\Delta_{\Psi}\hat{\varphi}[\mathcal{L}_{\phi}f]\Delta_{\Psi}\hat{\pi}[\mathcal{L}_{\phi}f] = \frac{1}{2} \quad (6.26)$$

saturating Heisenberg's uncertainty principle.¹¹

7. CARRYING OPERATORS FROM $\mathcal{H}$ TO $\mathcal{H}_{red}$

We have finished investigating the properties of A and B symmetry in the present simple model.

One of the nice properties of $\mathcal{H}_B$ is that the Hamiltonian preserves it, so that the Hamiltonian has a well-defined restriction to $\mathcal{H}_B$ which can then be carried over to $\mathcal{H}_{red}$ via the natural isomorphism. The operator thereby induced on $\mathcal{H}_{red}$ is the same as the Hamiltonian in the reduced theory, so that $\mathcal{H}_B$ gives a fully dynamical embedding of the reduced theory.

However, in more general situations, even if the Hamiltonian preserves a given choice of “symmetric sector” in a given theory, other operators of interest may not. It is therefore of interest to investigate the possibility of a general rule for carrying over *any* operator $\hat{O}$ on the full theory Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ to an operator $\hat{O}_{red}$ on the reduced theory Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_{red}$ that somehow “best approximates the information contained in $\hat{O}$.” We will motivate and suggest such a prescription for a completely general theory, and then look at applications to example operators in the model theory considered in this paper. We assume only that we are given some embedding ι of the reduced theory, $\mathcal{H}_{red}$ into the full theory $\mathcal{H}$.¹²

For $\hat{O}$ Hermitian (*i.e.*, symmetric), a list of physically desirable criteria for the corresponding $\hat{O}_{red}$ might include

1. $\hat{O}_{red}$ is Hermitian.
2. $\langle \iota\Psi_1, \hat{O}\iota\Psi_2 \rangle = \langle \Psi_1, \hat{O}_{red}\Psi_2 \rangle$
3. $\Delta_{\iota\Psi_1}\hat{O} = \Delta_{\Psi_1}\hat{O}_{red}$

for all Ψ_1, Ψ_2 in $\mathcal{H}_{red}$. That is, one might want Hermiticity, matrix elements and fluctuations to be preserved.

¹¹ There exists a complete basis of eigenfunctions f of Θ . However, technically $\hat{\varphi}[f]$ and $\hat{\pi}[g]$ are well defined as operators only when f and g are in $\mathcal{S}(\Sigma)$ — and no eigenstates of Θ are in $\mathcal{S}(\Sigma)$. Therefore, *prima facie* the spreads $\Delta_{\Psi}\hat{\varphi}[\mathcal{L}_{\phi}f]$ and $\Delta_{\Psi}\hat{\pi}[\mathcal{L}_{\phi}f]$ are not defined for eigenfunctions f . Nevertheless, the right hand sides of equations (6.24) and (6.25) are well defined for f an eigenfunction of Θ , so that we can take the spreads to be simply defined by these expressions in that case.

¹² This is yet another advantage of B symmetry, at least in the present simple model: the states are normalizable, and it is only in this case that the general prescription described here will apply. In the case of A symmetry, even though the Hamiltonian does not preserve $\mathcal{H}_A$, one might have still hoped to induce a Hamiltonian operator on $\mathcal{H}_{red}$ from that on $\mathcal{H}$ via some other manner, such as the one described here; but it is not at all obvious how to do that due to the non-normalizability of A-symmetric states. The combination of the Hamiltonian not preserving $\mathcal{H}_A$ and $\mathcal{H}_A$ not having any normalizable elements thus frustrates attempts to use A symmetry to compare the dynamics in the full and reduced theories in any systematic way.

Fortunately the second of these criteria uniquely determines $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{red}$:

$$\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{red} := \iota^{-1} \circ \mathcal{P} \circ \hat{\mathcal{O}} \circ \iota. \quad (7.1)$$

where $\mathcal{P} : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \iota[\mathcal{H}_{red}]$ denotes orthogonal projection. This is perhaps what one would first write down as a possible prescription. The point, however, is that this prescription is not *ad hoc*: it is uniquely determined by a physical criterion. Furthermore,

Theorem 7.1. *The prescription defined in (7.1) satisfies all three of the desired properties, except that the last property is replaced by*

$$\Delta_{\iota\Psi_1} \hat{\mathcal{O}} \geq \Delta_{\Psi_1} \hat{\mathcal{O}}_{red} \quad (7.2)$$

with equality holding iff $\hat{\mathcal{O}}$ preserves $\iota[\mathcal{H}_{red}]$.^{13 14}

Let us look at some example operators in the Klein-Gordon theory considered in the present paper. The example of $\hat{\mathbb{H}}$ has already been remarked upon. We proceed, then, to look at the basic configuration and momentum operators $\hat{\varphi}[f], \hat{\pi}[g]$. It is convenient to split these operators into parts. Define as operators on $\mathcal{H}$,

$$\hat{\tilde{\varphi}}_s[f] := \hat{\varphi}[f_s] \quad \hat{\tilde{\pi}}_s[g] := \hat{\pi}[g_s] \quad (7.4)$$

$$\hat{\tilde{\varphi}}_{\perp}[f] := \hat{\varphi}[f_{\perp}] \quad \hat{\tilde{\pi}}_{\perp}[g] := \hat{\pi}[g_{\perp}] \quad (7.5)$$

Note that the latter pair of operators are just the symmetry constraint operators. The tildes on these four operators are to distinguish them from the related operators on $\mathcal{H}_{red}$ and $\mathcal{H}_{\perp}$. For the configuration operators we have $\hat{\tilde{\varphi}}_s[f]\Psi[\varphi] = \varphi_s[f]\Psi[\varphi]$ and $\hat{\tilde{\varphi}}_{\perp}[f]\Psi[\varphi] = \varphi_{\perp}[f]\Psi[\varphi]$. In terms of the corresponding operators on $\mathcal{H}_{red}$ and $\mathcal{H}_{\perp}$,

$$\hat{\tilde{\varphi}}_s[f] := \hat{\varphi}_s[f] \otimes \mathbb{1} \quad \hat{\tilde{\pi}}_s[g] := \hat{\pi}_s[g] \otimes \mathbb{1} \quad (7.6)$$

$$\hat{\tilde{\varphi}}_{\perp}[f] := \mathbb{1} \otimes \hat{\varphi}_{\perp}[f] \quad \hat{\tilde{\pi}}_{\perp}[g] := \mathbb{1} \otimes \hat{\pi}_{\perp}[g] \quad (7.7)$$

$\hat{\tilde{\varphi}}_s[f]$ and $\hat{\tilde{\pi}}_s[g]$ both preserve $\mathcal{H}_B$, whereas $\hat{\tilde{\varphi}}_{\perp}[f]$ and $\hat{\tilde{\pi}}_{\perp}[g]$ do not. Nevertheless, on carrying these operators over to the reduced theory using (7.1) we get exactly what one would expect:

$$(\hat{\tilde{\varphi}}_s[f])_{red} = \hat{\varphi}_s[f] \quad (7.8)$$

$$(\hat{\tilde{\pi}}_s[g])_{red} = \hat{\pi}_s[g] \quad (7.9)$$

but

$$(\hat{\tilde{\varphi}}_{\perp}[f])_{red} = 0 \quad (7.10)$$

$$(\hat{\tilde{\pi}}_{\perp}[g])_{red} = 0. \quad (7.11)$$

¹³ As a side note, this result fully extends to non-Hermitian operators if we replace condition (1) with $(\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{red})^{\dagger} = (\hat{\mathcal{O}}^{\dagger})_{red}$, define the spread of a non-Hermitian operator by

$$\Delta_{\Psi} \hat{\mathcal{O}} := \sqrt{\langle \Psi, \frac{1}{2}(\hat{\mathcal{O}}^{\dagger} \hat{\mathcal{O}} + \hat{\mathcal{O}} \hat{\mathcal{O}}^{\dagger}) \Psi \rangle - |\langle \Psi, \hat{\mathcal{O}} \Psi \rangle|^2}. \quad (7.3)$$

and give as the condition for equality in (7.2) the condition that *both* $\hat{\mathcal{O}}$ and $\hat{\mathcal{O}}^{\dagger}$ preserve $\iota[\mathcal{H}_{red}]$.

¹⁴ Even though Hermiticity of $\hat{\mathcal{O}}$ implies $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{red}$ is Hermitian, *self-adjointness* of $\hat{\mathcal{O}}$ does not imply self-adjointness of $\hat{\mathcal{O}}_{red}$. This fact is discussed on page 19 of [13].

The inclusion of orthogonal projection in prescription (7.1) is essential in getting the last couple of equations above. Even though the symmetry constraint operators $\hat{\varphi}_\perp[f] = \hat{\varphi}[f_\perp]$ and $\hat{\pi}_\perp[g] = \hat{\pi}[g_\perp]$ do not annihilate $\mathcal{H}_B$, nevertheless, as one would hope, their corresponding operators induced on $\mathcal{H}_{red}$ via (7.1) are identically zero.

Lastly, one can also look at the angular momentum operator $\hat{\mathbb{L}}_z$. In the reduced classical theory the z -angular momentum is identically zero, so that one would expect the corresponding operator to be identically zero as well. Indeed,

$$(\hat{\mathbb{L}}_z)_{red} := \iota^{-1} \circ \mathcal{P} \circ \hat{\mathbb{L}}_z \circ \iota = 0 \quad (7.12)$$

as follows from $\mathcal{H}_B \subset \mathcal{H}_{inv}$.

8. SUMMARY AND OUTLOOK

A. Physical meaning(s) of $\mathcal{H}_B$

It is notable that $\mathcal{H}_B$ has a number of characterizations with completely distinct physical meaning all pointing to ways in which $\mathcal{H}_B$ embodies the notion of “symmetry.” They are

1. $\mathcal{H}_B$ is the solution space to a set of constraints whose classical analogues isolate the axisymmetric sector of the classical phase space;
2. $\mathcal{H}_B$ is the span of the coherent states associated with the axisymmetric sector of the classical theory;
3. $\mathcal{H}_B$ is the space of states in which all non-symmetric modes are unexcited. In terms of the Fock picture, this characterization of $\mathcal{H}_B$ took the form of corollary 6.2 and in terms of the Schrödinger picture this characterization took the form of theorem 6.4.

The first two of these in a clear way point to $\mathcal{H}_B$ as the “quantum analogue of the *classical* axisymmetric sector”. The idea of invariance under the group action (leading to $\mathcal{H}_{inv}$), on the other hand, is the quantum analogue of classical axisymmetry in a slightly more indirect sense. It is *invariance* under the quantum analogue of *classical rotation about the z axis*. It is a subtle but clear distinction. Another way to state this distinction is that in $\mathcal{H}_{inv}$ we are imposing ‘ $\mathcal{L}_\phi \Psi = 0$ ’, whereas in $\mathcal{H}_B$ we are imposing (an appropriate complex linear combination of) the conditions $\mathcal{L}_\phi \varphi(x) = 0$, $\mathcal{L}_\phi \pi(x) = 0$. In $\mathcal{H}_{inv}$ we are imposing axisymmetry on the *wave-function* whereas in $\mathcal{H}_B$ we are imposing axisymmetry on the *field operators*.

One can see the distinction in yet another way as well. Recall in the classical theory that the total angular momentum is given by the expression

$$\mathbb{L}_z = \int_\Sigma \pi(\mathcal{L}_\phi \varphi) d^3x \quad (8.1)$$

Classically the condition $\mathbb{L}_z = 0$ is weaker than the condition that $\mathcal{L}_\phi \varphi = 0$ and $\mathcal{L}_\phi \pi = 0$. Likewise, as theorem 5.4 and corollary 6.5 showed us, quantum mechanically $\hat{\mathbb{L}}_z \Psi = 0$ is weaker than (an appropriate reformulation of) $\mathcal{L}_\phi \hat{\varphi}(x) \Psi = 0$ and $\mathcal{L}_\phi \hat{\pi}(x) \Psi = 0$. Again, it is $\mathcal{H}_B$ (and $\mathcal{H}_A$) that is playing the role of the quantum analogue(s) of classical axisymmetry.

Furthermore, as was seen in section 6C, one can grasp the difference between $\mathcal{H}_{inv}$ and $\mathcal{H}_B$ in terms of fluctuations from axisymmetry. Expectation values for field operators are axisymmetric both for states in $\mathcal{H}_{inv}$ and for states in $\mathcal{H}_B$. However, the standard deviation, or “fluctuations”, of $\hat{\varphi}[\mathcal{L}_\phi f]$ and $\hat{\pi}[\mathcal{L}_\phi g]$ from zero are completely controlled in $\mathcal{H}_B$, whereas in $\mathcal{H}_{inv}$ one has no control over these fluctuations.

Lastly, it is $\mathcal{H}_B$ and $\mathcal{H}_A$ that achieve commutation of symmetry reduction and quantization, the former at the full level of dynamics. $\mathcal{H}_{inv}$ does not achieve commutation at any level.

B. Future directions: sketch of application to LQG

As pointed out earlier, the embedding of symmetry reduced theories into full loop quantum gravity suggested by Bojowald is analogous to the embedding $\mathcal{H}_A$ in the Klein-Gordon model considered here. Nevertheless, in the Klein-Gordon model, we saw that, for multiple reasons, the embedding $\mathcal{H}_B$ is preferable to $\mathcal{H}_A \subseteq \text{Cyl}_A^*$:

1. $\hat{\mathbb{H}}$ preserves $\mathcal{H}_B$ whereas $\hat{\mathbb{H}}^*$ does not preserve $\mathcal{H}_A$. Consequently, it is only $\mathcal{H}_B$ that gives us an embedding of *both* Hilbert space structure and dynamics.
2. Fluctuations from axisymmetry in $\mathcal{H}_B$ are more evenly distributed between configuration and momentum variables, and are in a certain sense minimized.
3. $\mathcal{H}_B$ is the span of the set of coherent states associated with the symmetric sector of the classical theory — a particularly elegant characterization that brings out a physical content not shared by $\mathcal{H}_A$.

It would be ideal, then, if one could extend the notion of B-symmetry (embodied in $\mathcal{H}_B$) to the case of LQG. The most obvious avenue for this is to use the characterization in theorem 6.3 — that of the span of semi-classical states associated with the symmetric sector of the classical theory. For, ideas on semi-classical states in LQG have already been introduced [14, 15, 16]. Indeed, one of the results in [12] seems to partially support this strategy. There it was found that one had to restrict precisely to coherent symmetric states before one could reproduce in full LQG a result known in the reduced theory — namely, the boundedness of the inverse volume operator.¹⁵

¹⁵ The following is a side note. [12] nevertheless found that, on more general states approximately invariant under the action of the symmetry group (translations and rotations) on large scales, the inverse volume operator is *unbounded*. From this they conclude that “the boundedness of the inverse scale factor in isotropic and homogeneous LQC does not extend to the full theory even when restricting LQG to those states which one would use to describe a maximally homogeneous and isotropic situation (modulo fluctuations)” (pp.4-5).

However, in light of the present research, as written, this statement is not wholly just. For, as was pointed out earlier, in quantum gravity, the notion of symmetry given simply by invariance under the action of the symmetry group becomes trivial once one goes to the level of solutions to the diffeomorphism constraint. Therefore, the symmetry restriction used in [12] to make the statement of unboundedness is, strictly speaking, empty of physical content. Rather, as has been a main point of this paper, when comparing a full quantum theory with a corresponding symmetry reduced theory, the notion of symmetric

However, there is a freedom in the choice of semiclassical states used in defining $\mathcal{H}_B^{LQG}$. Let us consider how this freedom can be used to reproduce additional characteristics of B-symmetry.

First, characterization (1) listed in the last subsection is easily reproduced by using complexifier coherent states. To see this, let P denote the $SU(2)$ principal bundle for the theory, with base space Σ . Let $\mathcal{S}$, a subgroup of the automorphisms of P , be the symmetry group of interest. Then if we define $\mathcal{H}_B^{LQG}$ to be the span of complexifier coherent states associated with symmetric field configurations, all states Ψ in $\mathcal{H}_B^{LQG}$ will satisfy

$$\widehat{(\Phi_\alpha^* A^C(e) - A^C(e))} \Psi = \left(U_\alpha \hat{A}^C(e) U_\alpha^{-1} - \hat{A}^C(e) \right) \Psi = 0 \quad (8.2)$$

for all edges e and all $\alpha \in \mathcal{S} \subset \text{Aut}(P)$. Here Φ_α and U_α denote the action of α on the kinematical phase space and kinematical Hilbert space, respectively. $\hat{A}^C(\cdot)$ are the “annihilation operators” defined in [14] depending on a particular choice of complexifier. The classical constraints under the hat on the left hand side select uniquely, at the classical level, the $(\mathcal{S})$ -symmetric sector.¹⁶ So, again like $\mathcal{H}_B$ in the scalar field case, $\mathcal{H}_B^{LQG}$ will solve a set of constraints that, at the classical level, uniquely select the appropriate classical symmetric sector.

Perhaps more importantly, one would like to reproduce the property that $\mathcal{H}_B$ is preserved by the Hamiltonian (in the case of LQG, a constraint in the bulk). It is not obvious how to do this; nevertheless we mention some possibilities. Perhaps complexifier coherent states could again be used, with the complexifier being ‘tailored’ to the dynamics in some way; or perhaps one needs a different approach. Essentially what one needs is ‘*temporally stable*’ or ‘*dynamical*’ coherent states if $\mathcal{H}_B$ is to be preserved by the Hamiltonian constraint. This can be seen as follows. Let Γ denote the classical phase space for a given theory, and let $\mathcal{H}$ denote the corresponding quantum state space. Define a family of coherent states $F : \Gamma \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ (associating each classical phase space point with a quantum state) to be temporally stable if there exists a map $A : \Gamma \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \Gamma$ such that

$$e^{-it\hat{H}} F(p) = F(A(p, t)) \quad (8.3)$$

for all $p \in \Gamma$ and $t \in \mathbb{R}$. Suppose we are given a group G with action on both Γ and $\mathcal{H}$. Suppose the Hamiltonian $\hat{H}$ is G -invariant, and the family of coherent states F is chosen to be G -covariant. It is not hard to see that $A(p, t)$ will be G -covariant as well. If we then define $\mathcal{H}_B$ to be the span of all $F(p)$ for $p \in \mathcal{H}$ fixed by G , $\hat{H}$ will preserve $\mathcal{H}_B$, as desired.

The problem of constructing temporally stable coherent states is discussed in [17, 18, 19]. In [17] and [18], two general schemes are given for constructing stable families of coherent states. Unfortunately in both of these schemes, the label space for the coherent states is no longer necessarily the classical phase space, Γ , whence it is not obvious whether it is possible

sector in the full theory should be more restrictive than the one defined by invariance under the symmetry group action. And, on the choice of “symmetric sector” suggested by the present research, [12] did find boundedness.

¹⁶ assuming the $A^C(e)$ for all edges e separate points in the kinematical phase space. This is guaranteed to be true at least locally on the phase space and is hoped to hold globally for complexifiers of physical interest [14].

or appropriate to use such coherent states in constructing $\mathcal{H}_B^{LQG}$ in the manner described above. In [19], on the other hand, Γ is retained as the label space for the coherent states, but they conclude that *exactly* stable families of coherent states do not always exist, but rather, for interacting theories, one in general expects only *approximately* stable families. However, this statement is made for a fixed set of ‘fundamental operators’ used to characterize semiclassicality; it is not clear it holds if the choice of ‘fundamental operators’ is not so fixed.

We leave investigation along these lines to future research. The main reason for desiring $\mathcal{H}_B^{LQG}$ to be preserved by the Hamiltonian constraint is that then a constraint operator $\hat{C}(x)_{red}$ is induced on $\mathcal{H}_B^{LQG}$, making $(\mathcal{H}_B^{LQG}, \hat{C}(x)_{red})$ a closed system that could be compared, for example, with loop quantum cosmology. However, even if $\mathcal{H}_B^{LQG}$ is not preserved by dynamics, $\mathcal{H}_B^{LQG}$ is still valuable in that it gives us a notion of ‘symmetric sector’. This notion of ‘symmetric sector’ can in principle be transferred to the physical Hilbert space (as described below), at which point preservation by constraints is no longer an issue. Comparison with LQC might then be attempted directly at the level of the physical Hilbert space [20].

Next let us discuss two issues related to constraints. First, as just touched upon, is the question of how one might obtain from $\mathcal{H}_B^{LQG}$ a ‘symmetric sector’ in the final *physical* Hilbert space of LQG. Let $\mathcal{H}_{kin}$ denote the kinematical Hilbert space of the theory, let $\mathcal{H}_{Diff}$ denote the solution to the Gauss and diffeomorphism constraints, and let $\mathcal{H}_{Phys}$ denote the space solving the Hamiltonian constraint as well. We have already suggested how to define the “B-symmetric sector” in $\mathcal{H}_{kin}$. To obtain a notion of symmetric sector in $\mathcal{H}_{Diff}$, the obvious strategy is to group average the “B-symmetric states” in $\mathcal{H}_{kin}$. This strategy is natural in light of [21] and the fact that we are using the definition of the symmetric sector inspired by theorem 6.3. Furthermore, if one follows the master constraint programme [22], one can use the master constraint to group average¹⁷ states from $\mathcal{H}_{Diff}$ to $\mathcal{H}_{Phys}$ and so transfer the notion of symmetric sector to $\mathcal{H}_{Phys}$.

The second issue related to constraints is that of gauge-fixing the symmetry group — that is, choosing a symmetry group which is not invariant under conjugation by diffeomorphisms and gauge transformations. Such a choice of symmetry group is made in LQC, for example. We note the following: on group averaging the symmetric sector over gauge transformations and diffeomorphisms, any such gauge-fixing will be washed out. This can be seen as follows. Let $\mathcal{H}_B^G$ denote the “symmetric sector” of $\mathcal{H}_{kin}$ corresponding to the subgroup G of the automorphism group of the principal bundle. If the only “background” used in the construction of $\mathcal{H}_B^G$ is the choice of group G , then, for any automorphism α of P , we will have covariance:

$$U_\alpha[\mathcal{H}_B^G] = \mathcal{H}_B^{\alpha \cdot G \cdot \alpha^{-1}}. \quad (8.4)$$

Now, if we had not gauge fixed, our symmetric sector would consist in the span of all $\mathcal{H}_B^{\alpha \cdot G \cdot \alpha^{-1}}$ for α in the automorphism group. This follows from the fact that we are defining the quantum symmetric sector as the span of coherent states associated with the classical symmetric sector. Thus, from the above equation, it is clear that on group averaging over the automorphism group, one will obtain the same subspace of $\mathcal{H}_{Diff}$ whether one gauge fixes the symmetry group or doesn’t.

Indeed, this situation can be mimicked in the Klein-Gordon toy model by simply declaring, for example, that $\mathbb{L}_x, \mathbb{L}_y, \mathbb{L}_z$ be constraints. This is a first class system, and the gauge

¹⁷ or, more or less equivalently, use the zero eigenvalue spectral projection operator for the master constraint

group generated is the full group of $SO(3)$ rotations about the origin. In this context, the group of rotations about the z -axis is then

1. a subgroup of the full canonical gauge group.
2. furthermore a gauge-fixed group. It is not left invariant by conjugation by the rest of the canonical gauge group.

These two properties precisely mimic the situation in loop quantum cosmology. In this toy model, one has the possibility check that certain nice properties of $\mathcal{H}_B$ are preserved by the group averaging procedure, such as the minimization of fluctuations from axisymmetry. This could possibly be done by group averaging the kinematical symmetry constraints $\{\hat{\varphi}[\mathcal{L}_\phi f], \hat{\pi}[\mathcal{L}_\phi g]\}$ to obtain operators on the physical Hilbert space. One could then calculate the fluctuations of these operators from zero for the proposed symmetric sector in the physical Hilbert space.

A final note. What has mainly been discussed thus far is how one should define the notion of “symmetric sector” in LQG appropriate for comparison with reduced models. It is not at all clear, however, whether one should expect the “symmetric sector” so defined to be isomorphic to the Hilbert space in the corresponding model quantized a la Bojowald.¹⁸ If it is not, we argue that the physics of the “symmetric sector” defined along the lines suggested in this section should be considered the “more fundamental” description. Perhaps one could even formulate the physics of this sector in such a way that one could easily calculate corrections to predictions made using Bojowald-type models such as LQC.

Acknowledgements

The author would like to thank Abhay Ashtekar for suggesting the initial direction for this research and for helpful discussions, Martin Bojowald and Florian Conrady for helpful discussions, and Daniele Perini for raising an initial question in part leading to this research. In addition, the author thanks Abhay Ashtekar and Florian Conrady for looking over a draft of this paper, and thanks the referees for their comments which resulted in significant improvements in the final draft. This work was supported in part by NSF grant PHY-0090091, the Eberly Research Funds of Penn State, and the Frymoyer and Duncan Fellowships of Penn State.

APPENDIX A: THE REDUCED-THEN-QUANTIZED FREE SCALAR FIELD THEORY

Let (ρ, z, ϕ) denote standard cylindrical coordinates on Σ such that the symmetry vector field ϕ^a is equal to $\frac{\partial}{\partial \phi}$. Let $B := \Sigma/\mathcal{T}$ denote the reduced spatial manifold. Let $P : \Sigma \rightarrow B$ denote canonical projection, and let $q^{ab} := P_* g^{ab}$. B may be coordinatized by (ρ, z) , which are

¹⁸ There is a fundamental difference between the configuration algebra underlying the full theory and the configuration algebra underlying LQC and other Bojowald-type models. Specifically: in the Bojowald-type models, only holonomies along edges adapted to the symmetry are included in the algebra. This makes isomorphism with $\mathcal{H}_B^{LQG}$ seem less likely unless perhaps $\mathcal{H}_B^{LQG}$ is modified in some way.

then Cartesian coordinates for $q_{ab} := (q^{ab})^{-1}$. The configuration and momentum variables φ and π may then be represented by functions on B .

More specifically, for φ and π symmetric, we define¹⁹

$$\varphi_r(\rho, z) = \sqrt{2\pi}\varphi(\rho, z) \quad \pi_r(\rho, z) = \sqrt{2\pi}\rho\pi(\rho, z) \quad (\text{A.2})$$

(The $\sqrt{2\pi}$ factors are included for later convenience.) Let Γ_{red} denote the reduced phase space – the space of all possible $[\varphi_r, \pi_r]$ ²⁰. The symplectic structure induced on Γ_{red} is simply

$$\Omega([\varphi_r, \pi_r], [\varphi'_r, \pi'_r]) = \int_B (\pi_r \varphi'_r - \varphi_r \pi'_r) d\rho dz \quad (\text{A.3})$$

Thus we see that at least kinematically, in terms of (φ_r, π_r) , the reduced theory is nothing other than a free Klein-Gordon theory on B with flat metric q_{ab} .²¹ From the time evolution of (φ, π) in the full theory, the time-evolution of (φ_r, π_r) is

$$\dot{\varphi}_r = \rho^{-1} \pi_r \quad (\text{A.4})$$

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\pi}_r &= \rho(\Delta_\Sigma - m^2)\varphi_r \\ &= \rho(\Delta_B + \frac{1}{\rho} \frac{\partial}{\partial \rho} - m^2)\varphi_r \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.5})$$

where Δ_Σ denotes the Laplacian on Σ determined by g_{ab} and Δ_B denotes the Laplacian on B determined by q_{ab} . Let $\Theta := -\Delta_\Sigma + m^2 = -\Delta_B - \frac{1}{\rho} \frac{\partial}{\partial \rho} + m^2$. Note that from $(\Theta^q f, g)_\Sigma = (f, \Theta^q g)_\Sigma$ for arbitrary $q \in \mathbb{Q}$, it follows $(\rho \Theta^q f, g)_B = (f, \rho \Theta^q g)_B$.

Given a choice of parametrization of time, from [5], the naturally associated complex structure on the classical phase space is

$$J = -(-\mathcal{L}_\xi \mathcal{L}_\xi)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \mathcal{L}_\xi \quad (\text{A.6})$$

where $\mathcal{L}_\xi$ denotes derivative with respect to the time evolution vector field ξ . From (A.4, A.5), one then calculates

$$J[\varphi_r, \pi_r] = [-\Theta^{-\frac{1}{2}} \rho^{-1} \pi_r, \rho \Theta^{\frac{1}{2}} \varphi_r]. \quad (\text{A.7})$$

Following [5], the Hermitian inner product thereby determined on the classical phase space is

$$\langle [\varphi_r, \pi_r], [\varphi'_r, \pi'_r] \rangle = \frac{1}{2}(\rho \Theta^{\frac{1}{2}} \varphi_r, \varphi'_r)_B + \frac{1}{2}(\Theta^{-\frac{1}{2}} \rho^{-1} \pi_r, \pi'_r)_B - \frac{i}{2}(\pi_r, \varphi'_r)_B + \frac{i}{2}(\varphi_r, \pi'_r)_B \quad (\text{A.8})$$

¹⁹ The definition of π_r can be motivated by considering the weight one densitization of π , $\tilde{\pi} := (\det g)^{\frac{1}{2}} \pi$. Using the projection mapping $P : \Sigma \rightarrow B$, we can then define $\tilde{\pi}_r := \sqrt{2\pi} P_* \tilde{\pi}$, where the push-forward is defined by treating $\tilde{\pi}$ as a measure. If we then dedensitize $\tilde{\pi}_r$ using q_{ab} : $\pi_r := (\det q)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \tilde{\pi}_r$, then

$$\pi_r = \sqrt{2\pi} \rho \pi. \quad (\text{A.1})$$

²⁰ Classically there are also boundary conditions which φ_r and π_r must satisfy at $\rho = 0$ in order to ensure smoothness. However, when going over to the quantum theory, because there is no surface term in the symplectic structure at $\rho = 0$, there are no separate degrees of freedom at $\rho = 0$, and the boundary conditions do not matter.

²¹ Note the role of the definition of φ_r and π_r in making this the case.

where $(f, g)_B := \int_B f g d\rho dz$ ²². We take the quantum configuration space to be $\mathcal{S}'(B)$, with quantum measure given, again following [5], by

$$“d\mu_{red} = \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2}(\varphi, \rho \Theta^{\frac{1}{2}} \varphi)_B \right\} \mathcal{D}\varphi.” \quad (\text{A.9})$$

More rigorously, the Fourier transform of the measure is given by

$$\chi_{\mu_{red}}(f) = \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2}(f, \Theta^{-\frac{1}{2}} \rho^{-1} f)_B \right\} \quad (\text{A.10})$$

We will denote the space of cylindrical functions in the reduced theory by Cyl_{red} . That is, Cyl_{red} is the space of functions $\Phi : \mathcal{S}'(B) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ of the form

$$\Phi[\alpha] = F(\alpha(f_1), \dots, \alpha(f_n)) \quad (\text{A.11})$$

for some $f_1, \dots, f_n \in \mathcal{S}(B)$ and some smooth $F : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ with growth less than exponential.

The representation of the field observables $\varphi[f] := \int_B f \varphi$ and $\pi[g] := \int_B g \pi$ is given by

$$(\hat{\varphi}_r[f] \Psi)[\varphi_r] = \varphi_r[f] \Psi[\varphi_r] \quad (\text{A.12})$$

$$(\hat{\pi}_r[g] \Psi)[\varphi_r] = -i \int_B \left(g \frac{\delta}{\delta \varphi_r} - \varphi_r \rho \Theta^{\frac{1}{2}} g \right) \Psi[\varphi].^{23} \quad (\text{A.13})$$

For a given point $[\varphi_r, \pi_r] = [f, g]$ in the classical phase space, we have the “classical observables” for the corresponding annihilation and creation operators:

$$\begin{aligned} a_{red}([f, g]) |_{[\varphi_r, \pi_r]} &= \langle [f, g], [\varphi_r, \pi_r] \rangle \\ &= \frac{1}{2}(\varphi_r[\rho \Theta^{\frac{1}{2}} f - ig] + \pi_r[\Theta^{-\frac{1}{2}} \rho^{-1} g + if]) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.14})$$

$$\begin{aligned} a_{red}^\dagger([f, g]) |_{[\varphi_r, \pi_r]} &= \langle [\varphi_r, \pi_r], [f, g] \rangle \\ &= \frac{1}{2}(\varphi_r[\rho \Theta^{\frac{1}{2}} f + ig] + \pi_r[\Theta^{-\frac{1}{2}} \rho^{-1} g - if]) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.15})$$

Quantizing by substituting in (A.12, A.13), we obtain

$$a_{red}^\dagger([f, g]) = \varphi_r[\rho \Theta^{\frac{1}{2}} f + ig] - \frac{i}{2} \int_B \left\{ \Theta^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\rho^{-1} g) - if \right\} \frac{\delta}{\delta \varphi_r} \quad (\text{A.16})$$

$$a_{red}([f, g]) = -\frac{i}{2} \int_B \left\{ \Theta^{-\frac{1}{2}}(\rho^{-1} g) + if \right\} \frac{\delta}{\delta \varphi_r} \quad (\text{A.17})$$

Lastly we quantize the (reduced) Hamiltonian. The reduced Hamiltonian is

$$\mathbb{H}_{red} = \frac{1}{2} \int_B (\rho^{-1} \pi_r^2 + \rho (\vec{\nabla} \varphi_r)^2 + \rho m^2 \varphi_r^2) d\rho dz \quad (\text{A.18})$$

²² Unless otherwise specified, from now on all integrations over B are understood to be with respect to $d^2x := d\rho dz$, and all integrations over Σ are understood to be with respect to $d^3x := \rho d\rho dz d\phi$.

²³ As noted earlier, $\frac{\delta}{\delta \varphi_r}$ is defined with respect to the volume form $d\rho dz$.

This can be checked to be consistent with (A.3, A.4, A.5). We next rewrite the Hamiltonian,

$$\mathbb{H}_{red} = \frac{1}{2} \int_B (\rho^{-1} \pi_r^2 + \rho (\vec{\nabla} \varphi_r)^2 + \rho m^2 \varphi_r^2) d\rho dz \quad (\text{A.19})$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \int_B \left(\rho^{-1} \pi_r^2 + \rho \varphi_r \left\{ -\Delta_B - \rho^{-1} \frac{\partial}{\partial \rho} + m^2 \right\} \varphi_r \right) d\rho dz \quad (\text{A.20})$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \int_B (\rho^{-1} \pi_r^2 + \rho \varphi_r \Theta \varphi_r) d\rho dz \quad (\text{A.21})$$

From (A.4, A.5), we deduce the single particle Hamiltonian:

$$\hat{H}_{red}[\varphi_r, \pi_r] = J \frac{d}{dt} [\varphi_r, \pi_r] \quad (\text{A.22})$$

$$= [\Theta^{\frac{1}{2}} \varphi_r, \rho \Theta^{\frac{1}{2}} \rho^{-1} \pi_r] \quad (\text{A.23})$$

So,

$$\mathbb{H}_{red} = \langle [\phi_r, \pi_r], \hat{H}_{red}[\phi_r, \pi_r] \rangle \quad (\text{A.24})$$

matching one's expectations. Let $\{\xi_i = [f_i, g_i]\}$ denote an arbitrary basis of Γ_{red} , orthonormal with respect to $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$. Then,

$$\mathbb{H}_{red} = \sum_{i,j} \langle [\phi_r, \pi_r], \xi_i \rangle \langle \xi_i, \hat{H}_{red} \xi_j \rangle \langle \xi_j, [\phi_r, \pi_r] \rangle \quad (\text{A.25})$$

$$= \sum_{i,j} \langle \xi_i, \hat{H}_{red} \xi_j \rangle a_{red}^\dagger(\xi_i) a_{red}(\xi_j) \quad (\text{A.26})$$

To quantize we use the normal ordering above and substitute in (A.16, A.17), to obtain

$$\mathbb{H}_{red} = \int_{x \in B, y \in B} \left\{ A(x, y) \varphi_r(y) \frac{\delta}{\delta \varphi_r(x)} - B(x, y) \frac{\delta^2}{\delta \varphi_r(x) \delta \varphi_r(y)} \right\} \quad (\text{A.27})$$

where

$$A(x, y) := \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j} \langle \xi_i, \hat{H}_{red} \xi_j \rangle (f_j - i \Theta^{-\frac{1}{2}} \rho^{-1} g_j)(x) (\rho \Theta^{\frac{1}{2}} f_i + i g_i)(y) \quad (\text{A.28})$$

$$B(x, y) := \frac{1}{4} \sum_{i,j} \langle \xi_i, \hat{H}_{red} \xi_j \rangle (\Theta^{-\frac{1}{2}} g_i - i f_i)(x) (\Theta^{-\frac{1}{2}} \rho^{-1} g_j + i f_j)(y) \quad (\text{A.29})$$

By integrating against test functions, one can show $A(x, y)$ is the integral kernel of $\Theta^{\frac{1}{2}}$, and $B(x, y) = \frac{1}{2} \rho^{-1} \delta^2(x, y)$. It follows

$$\hat{\mathbb{H}}_{red} = \int_{x \in B} \left\{ (\Theta^{\frac{1}{2}} \varphi_r)(x) \frac{\delta}{\delta \varphi_r(x)} - \frac{1}{2} \rho^{-1} \frac{\delta^2}{\delta \varphi_r(x)^2} \right\}. \quad (\text{A.30})$$

This expression is in fact equal to (4.4). This can be seen in the following manner. Because the fields $\varphi_r(\rho, z)$ are in one-to-one correspondence with the axisymmetric fields $\varphi_s(\rho, z, \phi)$ ($\varphi_r = (2\pi)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \varphi_s$), functionals depending on a φ_r can be interpreted as functionals

depending on a symmetric field $\varphi_s(\rho, z, \phi)$ and vice-versa. Consequently $\frac{\delta}{\delta\varphi_r(\rho, z)}$ and $\frac{\delta}{\delta\varphi_s(\rho, z, \phi)}$ can be understood to operate on the same space. Furthermore, for all $f(\rho, z)$,

$$\begin{aligned}\int_B d\rho dz f(\rho, z) \frac{\delta}{\delta\varphi_r(\rho, z)} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{\Sigma} d\rho dz d\phi \rho f(\rho, z) \frac{\delta}{\delta\varphi_s(\rho, z, \phi)} \\ &= \sqrt{2\pi} \int_B d\rho dz \rho f(\rho, z) \frac{\delta}{\delta\varphi_s(\rho, z, \phi_o)}\end{aligned}\quad (\text{A.31})$$

where ϕ_o is arbitrary. Thus

$$\frac{\delta}{\delta\varphi_r(\rho, z)} = \sqrt{2\pi} \rho \frac{\delta}{\delta\varphi_s(\rho, z, \phi_o)}.\quad (\text{A.32})$$

Substituting this into (4.4) then gives (A.30).

APPENDIX B: LIST OF SYMBOLS AND BASIC RELATIONS

For Klein-Gordon model:

Σ	spatial hyperplane in Minkowski space
x^1, x^2, x^3	Cartesian coordinates on Σ
ρ, ϕ, z	cylindrical coordinates on Σ
$\text{Diff}(\Sigma)$	group of diffeomorphisms of Σ
$\mathcal{T} \subset \text{Diff}(\Sigma)$	the group of rotations about z-axis
$\vec{\phi} := \frac{\partial}{\partial\phi}$	axial symmetry field
$\mathcal{L}_{\phi}$	Lie derivative with respect to ϕ
$B := \Sigma/\mathcal{T}$	spatial manifold for the reduced theory
$d^2x = d\rho dz$	
$d^3x = \rho d\rho d\phi dz$	
$(f, g) = (f, g)_{\Sigma} := \int_{\Sigma} f g d^3x$	
$(f, g)_B := \int_B f g d^2x$	
Γ	full phase space
$[f, g]$	point in Γ defined by $\varphi = f$, $\pi = g$. (not to be confused with commutator; context makes clear which is intended)
$\Gamma_{inv} \subset \Gamma$	$\mathcal{T}$ -invariant subspace of Γ
$\Gamma_A \subset \Gamma$	classical solution to constraint set A
$\Gamma_B \subset \Gamma$	classical solution to constraint set B

$$\Gamma_A \subset \Gamma_{inv}$$

$$\Gamma_B = \Gamma_{inv}$$

$\Omega(\cdot, \cdot)$	symplectic structure on Γ ; in appendix A: symplectic structure in the reduced theory
$\Delta = \Delta_{\Sigma}$	Laplacian on Σ
Δ_B	Laplacian on B
m	scalar field mass
$\Theta := -\Delta + m^2$	

J	complex structure on Γ ; in appendix A: complex structure in the reduced theory
$\mathcal{S}(\Sigma), \mathcal{S}(B)$	space of Schwarz functions on Σ, B
$\mathcal{S}'(\Sigma), \mathcal{S}'(B)$	space of tempered distributions on Σ, B
$\mathcal{S}(\Sigma)_{inv}, \mathcal{S}'(\Sigma)_{inv}$	$\mathcal{T}$ -invariant subspaces of $\mathcal{S}(\Sigma)$ and $\mathcal{S}'(\Sigma)$, respectively
$P : \Sigma \rightarrow B$	canonical projection
$I : \mathcal{S}'(\Sigma)_{inv} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}'(B)$	is defined by $[I(\beta)](f) := \beta(P^*f)$; I is an isomorphism
π, Π	group averaging maps on $\mathcal{S}(\Sigma)$ and $\mathcal{S}'(\Sigma)$, respectively (see §4)
$\mathcal{S}(\Sigma)_\perp$	the kernel of π ; equivalently, the orthogonal complement of $\mathcal{S}(\Sigma)_{inv}$ in $\mathcal{S}(\Sigma)$
$\mathcal{S}'(\Sigma)_\perp$	the kernel of Π

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{S}(\Sigma)_{inv} &\stackrel{\text{nat.}}{\cong} \mathcal{S}(B) \\
\mathcal{S}'(\Sigma)_{inv} &\stackrel{\text{nat.}}{\cong} \mathcal{S}'(B) \\
\mathcal{S}(\Sigma) &= \mathcal{S}(\Sigma)_{inv} \oplus \mathcal{S}(\Sigma)_\perp \\
\mathcal{S}'(\Sigma) &= \mathcal{S}'(\Sigma)_{inv} \oplus \mathcal{S}'(\Sigma)_\perp
\end{aligned}$$

μ	quantum measure on $\mathcal{S}'(\Sigma)$
μ_{red}	quantum measure on $\mathcal{S}'(B)$
$\mu_\perp$	unique measure on $\mathcal{S}'(\Sigma)_\perp$ such that $\mu = \mu_{red} \times \mu_\perp$
h	single particle Hilbert space of full theory
$\bigotimes_n$	n -fold tensor product
$\bigotimes_s$	symmetrized n -fold tensor product
$\mathcal{H} := L^2(\mathcal{S}'(\Sigma), d\mu)$ $= \mathcal{F}_s(h)$	full field theory Hilbert space
$\mathcal{H}_{inv}$	$\mathcal{T}$ -invariant subspace of $\mathcal{H}$
$\mathcal{H}_{red}$ $:= L^2(\mathcal{S}'(B), d\mu_{red})$	reduced theory Hilbert space
$\mathcal{H}_\perp := L^2(\mathcal{S}'(\Sigma), d\mu_\perp)$	
$\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$	inner product on $h, \mathcal{H}, \mathcal{H}_{red}$, or $\mathcal{H}_\perp$, depending on context
Cyl, Cyl^*	space of cylindrical functions in the full theory, and its algebraic dual
$\text{Cyl}_{red}, \text{Cyl}_{red}^*$	space of cylindrical functions in the reduced theory, and its algebraic dual
$\text{Cyl}_\perp, \text{Cyl}_\perp^*$	space of cylindrical functions on $\mathcal{S}'(\Sigma)_\perp$, and the algebraic dual

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{H} &= \mathcal{H}_{red} \otimes \mathcal{H}_\perp \\
\text{Cyl} &\hookrightarrow \mathcal{H} \hookrightarrow \text{Cyl}^* \\
\text{Cyl}_{red} &\hookrightarrow \mathcal{H}_{red} \hookrightarrow \text{Cyl}_{red}^* \\
\text{Cyl}_\perp &\hookrightarrow \mathcal{H}_\perp \hookrightarrow \text{Cyl}_\perp^*
\end{aligned}$$

Cyl_{inv}^*	$\mathcal{T}$ -invariant subspace of Cyl^*
$\text{Cyl}_A^* \subset \text{Cyl}^*$	quantum mechanical solution to constraint set A
$\mathfrak{E} : \mathcal{H}_{red} \hookrightarrow \text{Cyl}^*$	is defined by $\mathfrak{E}(\Psi)[\Phi] := \langle \Psi, \Phi \circ I^{-1} \rangle$

$\mathcal{H}_A := \text{Im } \mathfrak{E} \subset \text{Cyl}_A^*$

$\mathcal{H}_B \subset \mathcal{H}$

h_{inv}

$h_\perp$

$\hat{\varphi}[f], \hat{\pi}[g]$

$f_s, f_\perp$

$\varphi_s, \varphi_\perp$

$\pi_s, \pi_\perp$

$\varphi_r = \varphi_{red}$
 $:= (2\pi)^{\frac{1}{2}} \varphi_s,$

$\pi_r = \pi_{red}$
 $:= (2\pi)^{\frac{1}{2}} \rho \pi_s$

$\hat{\varphi}_r[f] = \hat{\varphi}_{red}[g]$

$\hat{\pi}_r[g] = \hat{\pi}_{red}[g]$

$\hat{\varphi}_s[f], \hat{\pi}_s[g]$

$\hat{\varphi}_\perp[f], \hat{\pi}_\perp[g]$

$a(\cdot), a^\dagger(\cdot)$

$a_r(\cdot) = a_{red}(\cdot)$

$a_r^\dagger(\cdot) = a_{red}^\dagger(\cdot)$

Ψ_0

$\hat{H}, \hat{H}_{red}$

$\mathbb{H}, \hat{\mathbb{H}}$

$\mathbb{H}_{red}, \hat{\mathbb{H}}_{red}$

$\hat{\mathbb{H}}_\perp$

$\mathbb{L}_x, \mathbb{L}_y, \mathbb{L}_z$

$\hat{\mathbb{L}}_z$

U_g

$\Delta_\Psi \hat{O}$

quantum mechanical solution to constraint set B

$\mathcal{T}$ -invariant subspace of h

orthogonal complement of h_{inv} in h

basic smeared field operators in the full theory

components of a given $f \in \mathcal{S}(\Sigma)$ with respect to the decomposition $\mathcal{S}(\Sigma) = \mathcal{S}(\Sigma)_{inv} \oplus \mathcal{S}(\Sigma)_\perp$

components of φ with respect to the decomposition $\mathcal{S}(\Sigma) = \mathcal{S}(\Sigma)_{inv} \oplus \mathcal{S}(\Sigma)_\perp$ or $\mathcal{S}'(\Sigma) = \mathcal{S}'(\Sigma)_{inv} \oplus \mathcal{S}'(\Sigma)_\perp$, according to the context

components of π with respect to the decomposition $\mathcal{S}(\Sigma) = \mathcal{S}(\Sigma)_{inv} \oplus \mathcal{S}(\Sigma)_\perp$
 basic classical fields in the reduced theory; relation to fields in the full theory.

smeared field operators in the reduced theory

the operators on $\mathcal{H}_{red}$ corresponding to the smeared functions $\varphi_s[f]$ and $\pi_s[g]$. $\hat{\varphi}_s[f]$ acts by multiplication and $\hat{\pi}_s[g]$ is the self-adjoint part of $-i \int_\Sigma g \frac{\delta}{\delta \varphi_s}$.

the operators on $\mathcal{H}_\perp$ corresponding to $\varphi_\perp[f]$ and $\pi_\perp[g]$. $\hat{\varphi}_\perp[f]$ is defined by multiplication and $\hat{\pi}_\perp[g]$ is the self-adjoint part of $-i \int_\Sigma g \frac{\delta}{\delta \varphi_\perp}$

$$\hat{\varphi}_s[f] = (2\pi)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \hat{\varphi}_{red}[f_s]$$

$$\hat{\pi}_s[g] = (2\pi)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \hat{\pi}_{red}[\rho^{-1} g_s]$$

$$\hat{\varphi}[f] = \hat{\varphi}_s[f] \otimes \mathbb{1} + \mathbb{1} \otimes \hat{\varphi}_\perp[f]$$

$$\hat{\pi}[g] = \hat{\pi}_s[g] \otimes \mathbb{1} + \mathbb{1} \otimes \hat{\pi}_\perp[g]$$

annihilation and creation operators in the full theory, or

their classical counterparts, depending on the context
 annihilation and creation operators in the reduced theory, or their classical counterparts, depending on the context

vacuum in the full theory (§2)

single particle Hamiltonians in the full and reduced theories, respectively

total Hamiltonian in the full theory and its quantization

total Hamiltonian in the reduced theory and its quantization

the unique operator on $\mathcal{H}_\perp$ such that $\hat{\mathbb{H}} = \hat{\mathbb{H}}_{red} \otimes \mathbb{1} + \mathbb{1} \otimes \hat{\mathbb{H}}_\perp$

x, y, and z-components, respectively, of the total angular momentum in the full classical theory

operator on $\mathcal{H}$ corresponding to $\mathbb{L}_z$

action of a given $g \in \mathcal{T}$ on $\mathcal{H}$

variance (“fluctuation”) in $\hat{O}$ for the state Ψ

$\hat{\Lambda}(\xi) := a^\dagger(\xi) - a(\xi)$	
$\Psi_\xi^{coh} := e^{\hat{\Lambda}(\xi)}\Psi_0$	coherent state in $\mathcal{H}$ corresponding to a given $\xi \in h$
$\text{span}\{\cdot\}$	Cauchy completion of the set of all finite linear combinations
<i>For LQG (§8 B):</i>	
Σ	spatial Cauchy surface
P	SU(2) principal bundle over Σ
$\text{Aut}(P)$	group of automorphisms of P
$\mathcal{S} \subset \text{Aut}(P)$	symmetry group under consideration
$\mathcal{H}_{kin}$	kinematical Hilbert space
$\mathcal{H}_{Diff}$	solution to Gauss and Diffeomorphism constraints
$\mathcal{H}_{Phys}$	solution to all constraints
$\mathcal{H}_B^{LQG} \subset \mathcal{H}_{kin}$	proposal for B-symmetric sector of LQG
Φ_α	action of $\alpha \in \text{Aut}(P)$ on the kinematical phase space
U_α	action of $\alpha \in \text{Aut}(P)$ on $\mathcal{H}_{kin}$
$\hat{A}^C(\cdot), A^C(\cdot)$	annihilation operators and their classical counterparts, as defined in [14]

-
- [1] Ashtekar A and Lewandowski J 2004 Background independent quantum gravity: A status report *Class. Quant. Grav.* **21** R53
Rovelli C 2004 *Quantum Gravity* (Cambridge: Cambridge UP)
Thiemann T 2003 Lectures on loop quantum gravity *Lect. Notes Phys.* **631** 41-135
- [2] Bojowald M 2002 Isotropic loop quantum cosmology *Class. Quant. Grav.* **19** 2717-2741
Bojowald M 2003 Homogeneous loop quantum cosmology *Class. Quant. Grav.* **20** 2595-2615
Ashtekar A, Bojowald M and Lewandowski J 2003 Mathematical structure of loop quantum cosmology *Adv. Theor. Math. Phys.* **7** 233-268
- [3] Tsujikawa S, Singh P and Maartens R 2004 Loop quantum gravity effects on inflation and the CMB *Class. Quant. Grav.* **21** 5767-5775
- [4] Bojowald M 2004 Spherically symmetric quantum geometry: States and basic operators *Class. Quant. Grav.* **21** 3733-3753
Bojowald M 2004 The volume operator in spherically symmetric quantum geometry *Class. Quant. Grav.* **21** 4881-4900
Bojowald M and Swiderski R 2005 Spherically symmetric quantum horizons *Phys. Rev. D* **71** 081501
Bojowald M, Goswami R, Maartens R and Singh P 2005 A black hole mass threshold from non-singular quantum gravitational collapse *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **95** 091302
Ashtekar A and Bojowald M 2005 Black hole evaporation: A paradigm *Class. Quant. Grav.* **22** 3349-3362
Ashtekar A and Bojowald M 2006 Quantum geometry and the Schwarzschild singularity *Class. Quantum Grav.* **23** 391-411
- [5] Corichi A, Cortez J and Quevedo H 2004 On the relation between Fock and Schrödinger representations for a scalar field *Annals Phys.* **313** 446-478 (*Preprint hep-th/0202070*)

- Ashtekar A and Magnon A 1987 Quantum fields in curved Space-times *Proc. Roy. Soc. Lond. A* **346** 375-394
- [6] Glimm J and Jaffe A 1987 *Quantum Physics: A Functional Integral Point of View* (New York: Springer-Verlag)
- [7] Reed M and Simon B 1980 *Functional Analysis* vol. 1 (San Diego: Academic Press)
- [8] Klauder J 1999 Universal procedure for enforcing quantum constraints *Nucl. Phys. B* **547** 397-412 (especially pp 399-400)
- [9] Ashtekar A 1991 *Lectures on Non-perturbative Canonical Gravity* (Singapore: World Scientific), appendix B
- [10] Tate R 1992 “An algebraic approach to the quantization of constrained systems: finite dimensional examples” Ph.D. Thesis, Syracuse University, pp 111-115
- [11] Bojowald M and Kastrup H A 2000 Quantum symmetry reduction for diffeomorphism invariant theories of connections *Class. Quant. Grav.* **17** 3009-3043
Bojowald M and Kastrup H A 2001 Symmetric states in quantum geometry *Preprint gr-qc/0101061*
- [12] Brunnemann J and Thiemann T 2006 On (cosmological) singularity avoidance in loop quantum gravity *Class. Quantum Grav.* **23** 1395-1427
- [13] Bojowald M and Strobl T 2000 Group theoretical quantization and the example of a phase space $S^1 \times \mathbb{R}^+$ *J. Math. Phys.* **41** 2537-2567
- [14] Thiemann T 2006 Complexifier Coherent States for quantum general relativity *Class. Quantum Grav.* **23** 2063-2117
- [15] Ashtekar A and Lewandowski J 2001 Relation between polymer and Fock excitations *Class. Quant. Grav.* **18** L117-L128
- [16] Conrady F 2005 Free vacuum for loop quantum gravity *Class. Quant. Grav.* **22** 3261-3293
- [17] Klauder J 1962 Continuous-representation theory I. Postulates of continuous-representation theory *J. Math. Phys.* **4** 1055-1058
Klauder J 1962 Continuous-representation theory II. Generalized relation between quantum and classical dynamics *J. Math. Phys.* **4** 1058-1073
- [18] Klauder J 1996 Coherent states for the hydrogen atom *J. Phys. A* **29** L293-L298
Crawford M 2000 Temporally stable coherent states in energy degenerate systems: The hydrogen atom *Phys. Rev. A* **62** 012104-1
Klauder J 2001 (June) “The current state of coherent states” Contribution to the 7th ICSSUR Conference (*Preprint quant-ph/0110108*)
- [19] Willis J 2004 “On the low-energy ramifications and a mathematical extension of loop quantum gravity” Ph.D. Thesis, Penn State University, pp 74-78
Bojowald M and Skrzewski A 2005 Effective equations of motion for quantum systems *Preprint math-ph/0511043*
- [20] Noui K, Perez A and Vandersloot K 2005 On the physical Hilbert space of loop quantum cosmology *Phys. Rev. D* **71** 044025
Ashtekar A, Pawłowski T and Singh P 2006 Quantum nature of the big-bang *Preprint gr-qc/0602086*
- [21] Ashtekar A, Bombelli L and Corichi A 2005 Semiclassical states for constrained systems *Phys. Rev. D* **72** 025008
- [22] Thiemann T 2003 The Phoenix project: Master constraint programme for loop quantum gravity *Preprint gr-qc/0305080*
Thiemann T 2005 Quantum spin dynamics VIII. The master constraint *Preprint*

gr-qc/0510011.